THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE melancholy task of considering what may be the last published work of Professor T. W. MANSON is the more poignant in that the book is itself composed of two memorial lectures—*Ministry and Priesthood : Christ's and Ours*.[1]

The first, and shorter, given at the 1956 Congress of the Free Church Federal Council, commemorates Dr. John Scott Lidgett. 'When one considers the range of his interests, the versatility of his mind, the depth of his convictions, and the breadth of his sympathies, the conclusion is obvious that for this hour we should turn our minds to great issues and try our best to think greatly and generously about them'. In this spirit Dr. MANSON discusses *some aspects of the ministry of Jesus and the task of His Church* not as separate and unrelated but as one. 'All our ecclesiastical designs are to be tested against the master plan depicted in the gospel. All our endeavours are to be understood as ways in which the Risen Lord continues His work in the world'. The aspects of Jesus Christ as Teacher, Conqueror, Sacrifice, with the correlatives for the task of the Church, are treated with simplicity and economy of language which only emphasises the depth of the thought. There is much to ponder upon and to draw from in these twenty pages. 'All these things hang together', Dr. MANSON concludes, 'they make a single and I think soul-satisfying picture. And what runs through the whole thing from first to last, what gives meaning to Teaching, Victory, and Sacrifice, are the perfect loving obedience to God and the perfect loving service to men rendered by Him who is at once Teacher and Teaching, Victor and Victory, Priest and Sacrifice'.

If we make larger reference to the second lecture it is because of its immediate relevance to an important issue of contemporary debate and not simply because it is longer and sustained with scholarly footnotes. This, *The Priesthood of Believers*, is the Arthur Samuel Peake Memorial Lecture of 1957. It continues what Dr. MANSON began in 1948 with his far-reaching criticism of 'The Apostolic Ministry', edited by the late Dr. K. E. Kirk, in 'The Church's Ministry'. Dr. Kirk had made it difficult to see what the priesthood of *all* believers can mean either corporately or individually so Dr. MANSON turns 'to non-episcopal sources in the hope of obtaining light on this "decisive formula of all non-episcopal Christendom"; and it must be confessed that the illumination is something less than dazzling'.

In a brilliant and compact historical note he shows the reasons for this and that there exists in regard to priesthood and ministry a real confusion, calling for careful study by Free Church scholars. 'It seems to me that the first essential in such an inquiry is to make clear to ourselves what we understand by the priesthood of all believers; and I would emphasize that the word that requires clarification is the word "priesthood". . . . It may be suspected that some who use it most often and most emphatically mean by it something more like "the priesthood of no believer whatsoever" or "the non-priesthood of all believers"'. From this misconstruction arise many questions which need answering both in the context of relations between the Free Churches and the Anglican Communion and in regard to the doctrine, or lack of doctrine, of the ministry in the former. 'The proper place at which to investigate is the place where the words priest and priesthood are relevant. In what sense are all believers priests; and in what special sense, if any, are the ordained ministers of the Church priests; and how are the two senses, if there are two, related to one another?'

Here Dr. MANSON turns back the inquiry to the New Testament where the first glance seems to suggest that the priestly idea had no place in the thought of Jesus and the life of the Early Church. But before we dismiss it as later and irrelevant intrusion there are other facts to consider, notably the decisive step taken by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews who cannot 'think of the death of Christ as a sacrifice without thinking of it as a self-sacrifice, that is, as an offering made to God in which priest and victim are identical . . . who works out the idea of Christ as high priest in connexion with the ritual of the

[1] Epworth Press; 6s. 6d. net.

Day of Atonement, [and] . . . makes a unique and precious contribution to the total picture. If that is so, his work is of primary importance for our understanding of the meaning of priesthood in the Christian dispensation; and we shall have to return to it again and again'.

The argument is developed by a detailed consideration of what the New Testament says about the priesthood of Christians called to share in the kind of self-sacrifice which makes it possible to apply 'high-priesthood' to Jesus' ministry. This Dr. MANSON defines as 'His complete self-dedication in unreserved obedience to God His Father and in unlimited love and compassion toward men His brethren. This conception must be normative for any Christian doctrine of priesthood and sacrifice; and it is obvious that priesthood so defined is something in which all believers can and, indeed, must have part . . . we may conclude, then, that the priesthood of all believers lies in the fact that each believer offers himself as a sacrifice according to the pattern laid down by Christ; and—what is equally essential—that all these individual offerings are taken up into the one perpetual offering made by the one eternal high-priest of the New Covenant'.

A brief examination of early Christian teaching shows the emergence of certain tendencies leading to a parting of the ways: 'Priesthood is on the way to be completely bound up with the right of a specialized group within the Church to offer the eucharistic sacrifice. . . . The priesthood of all believers, on the other hand, is on the way to become a godly sentiment with little or no relevance to the day-to-day practice of the Church at worship'. All underlines the need to maintain the New Testament doctrine of the priesthood of believers and of the high-priesthood of Christ; and to seek to clarify the relation of the ministers of the Church to both. Towards this task Dr. MANSON makes a brief closing contribution stressing two facts: the Church has a divinely appointed ministry from earliest days, and this is something less than the totality of members. 'In a word, while all believers are priests, all believers are not ministers. It is legitimate to argue that as all believers are priests and all ministers are believers, therefore all ministers are priests. It is fallacious to argue that since all ministers are priests and all believers are priests, therefore all believers are ministers'.

There may be nothing new in Dr. MANSON'S material but the manner of its use points forward to an important stage in ecumenical discussions. If he seems to use the language customary on one side of the argument it is very certain that he surrenders nothing of the convictions of the other. But he brings each closer to the other. If ever there is to be a 'Manson Lecture' it is to be hoped that it will give occasion for further consideration, especially on the Free Church side, of the questions here so adequately posed and so trenchantly answered.

Specialism is the feature of modern life and scholarship. Usually books are written by men who are specialists in their subject, and that often in the narrowest sense. It is nowadays, to say the least of it, unusual to find a man who is prophet, scholar, administrator, churchman, leader, and teacher. It is precisely because Dr. F. R. BARRY has a real claim to be all these things that this book on the ministry and the call to it is of such extraordinary importance.

The title of Dr. BARRY'S book is *Vocation and Ministry*.[1] Dr. BARRY begins by insisting that vocation to the ministry must be considered in the wider context of vocation in general. It is the tragedy of the present situation that the idea of vocation in so-called ordinary affairs has almost vanished. 'Indeed, it is hardly a parody to say that vocation has come to be equated with the peculiar experience of clergymen to which other Christians remain strangers'. Dr. BARRY insists that 'Vocation is not an officer's privilege which privates in the Church should not expect. It is something inherent in Christianity'. Every task can be a task given by God. 'The essential meaning of sin for those who know God is to withhold the service that is His due'. We must remember that the God of all the earth is not solely interested in what we technically call religion. The pre-Reformation tendency to think of so-called secular activities as 'sub-Christian' is fatal, as is the kindred idea of a double morality, one morality for laymen and one for the clergy. Christian vocation must be expressed in activities and skills and techniques which are not in the narrow sense of the term religious at all. Vocation can be found in 'playing a game or in building a cathedral'. There is clamant necessity for what Maritain calls 'secular sanctity', and what Dr. Vidler calls 'holy worldliness'.

Dr. BARRY has a kind of invincible common sense in his approach to this matter. He pours scorn on the idea that a man's vocation is probably to that which he most dislikes doing! And he suggests that a man's vocation may well be to do that which he does best and most efficiently. Dr. BARRY is not blind to the fact that there are

[1] Nisbet; 12s. 6d. net.

occupations to which the name of vocation is difficult to attach, and there are many who cannot in any real sense of the term be said to choose their work at all. But, even allowing for that, the idea and the conviction of vocation give an *attitude* to *any* work which is all-important.

At the moment the problem is serious in the Church. Dr. BARRY speaks for the Church of England, but the problem is universal. In the Middle Ages the proportion between secular and religious was that there was at least one cleric—perhaps even two clerics—to every hundred lay people. Nowadays the proportion at the highest is that there is one cleric for about every twelve hundred lay people. In the Middle Ages there were in England about nine thousand five hundred parishes, each staffed by five clerics. The situation is serious and will become more serious. In 1886 in the Church of England there were eight hundred and fourteen Ordinations; in 1956 there were four hundred and ninety-six, which was the highest number for fifteen years. Further, the average age of the clergy to-day is fifty-two, and of the four hundred and ninety-six ordained in 1956 twenty-five per cent. were over forty years of age.

Clearly there is difficulty and even disaster ahead. Against one thing Dr. BARRY's face is set. There must above all be no lowering of the standards of those who are allowed to enter the ministry. In 1557 Bishop Hooper found that in his diocese there were only fifty clergy who could answer such questions as 'How many Commandments are there?' 'Repeat the Lord's Prayer'. 'Where is it to be found?' But by 1603 in the Lincoln diocese six hundred and forty-six of the clergy—more than half—were graduates. Dr. BARRY is clear that standards must be maintained. The Universities must not be asked for concessions in training. The Church can only be effective in the Universities as it can satisfy the tests proper to the Universities. It must be able to command the intellectual respect of the Universities and enrich their lives. Apart from that, 'Every weak candidate will act as a deterrent to stronger men'. There are too many candidates for the ministry of whom the best that can be said is that 'there is nothing to be said against them'.

In pleading for the conservation of standards Dr. BARRY does not desire uniformity of standards. He would like to see a training where philosophers and linguists were not scientifically illiterate, and where scientists and technicians were not culturally uneducated. He would like to see training in which men were taught to face the contemporary situation so that they would no longer spend their time answering questions which no one is asking. And he would like to see training flexible enough to receive and train those who have real gifts but not academic gifts.

But Dr. BARRY's real revolution is his plea for a supplementary—not a substitutionary—ministry. He would like to see ordained to the priesthood men of gifts and training who still carried on their 'secular' employment. Such men would demonstrate the reality of real vocation. They would be ordained to the whole ministry of the Church, not simply to preaching. 'To ask a man to do nothing but preach is imperilling his immortal soul'. Further, these men would be offered by the congregation, not chosen from above. They would be men who by their gifts and their personality had emerged within the Christian fellowship. Dr. BARRY rightly insists that such men are much more in the succession of the presbyters of the Early Church than a young man who goes straight from his training College to a pastoral charge. Especially in the country districts such a ministry would be invaluable. To set a man in charge of a plurality of parishes may be efficient in the business sense, but it is fatal in the religious sense. 'An itinerant president at the Lord's Table is almost incompatible with what the Eucharist of the Church means . . . And the notion of a visiting shepherd hardly makes sense'. Dr. BARRY holds that if the Church is really to serve the people, not of the Church, but of the whole country, if the Church is to be an outgoing Church, some such adventure is a necessity.

There are many other things in this book which are brave and challenging. Dr. BARRY would like the Church to make much more use of the theological faculties of the Universities in the training of its students, for it is there that the best technical teaching can be found. The Church has a ministry of reconciliation. How can it effectively discharge that ministry until it is reconciled within itself? If the Church retires within itself and abandons its outgoing mission and commission it will perish.

This is a book written with the mature and wise judgment of one who has long lived in the Church and long served the Church. But it is written also with the adventurousness of one whose mind is ever elastic and whose heart is ever young. All who have the problems of the Church and ministry at their hearts should read this book. They may not agree with it. But if they do not like its solutions, they must find better solutions of their own.

The Theology of John Wyclif

By the Reverend John Stacey, B.D., Altrincham, Cheshire

John Wyclif came south from his Yorkshire home in 1345 to take up residence as an Oxford student and subsequently his theological studies followed the accepted pattern of the day. The first seven or eight years were devoted to the arts, including grammar, logic and philosophy. Then came the doctorate in theology comprising three years on the text of the Vulgate, two years on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, a year lecturing on the Old and New Testaments, and finally a period as a 'sententiary' under oath to teach nothing contrary to the Catholic faith. This process, together with much reading of the Doctors of the Church, Wyclif completed successfully in 1372. With the exception of the debatable doctrine of the Eucharist which he propounded in 1370 in *De Benedicta Incarnacione* all this was the orthodox study of Catholic doctrine. Wyclif was no reformer in his student days, neither in arts nor theology. The philosophical works of his earlier years are voluminous but orthodox, though his realism paved the way for his later rejection of Transubstantiation. As H. B. Workman says, 'The reader would err greatly if he ascribed to Wyclif any revolt against current scholastic thought.' His early theology took no revolutionary turn.

With the passing years Wyclif reacted against the mediæval church as he saw it in action. Most current ecclesiastical practices came under the lash of his tongue. He strongly disapproved of relic worship, '*inordinatus ac cupidus cultus circa reliquias*' ('the inordinate and avaricious cult of relics') (*De Ecclesia*) and opposed the sale of indulgences because '*indulgere peccatoribus est Deo proprium*' ('to be indulgent with sins is the prerogative of God') (*De Ecclesia*). He considered the prevalent habit of auricular confession unnecessary; he did not believe that canonization was proof of sanctity, and he maintained that excommunication, when unjust, had no real effect. His attacks on the clergy and their habits were legion. He condemned, not without reason, the morality of the friars, the uselessness of the monks and the worldly ambitions of the episcopacy. The 'Cæsarean clergy,' as he called all those who were in secular employment, received some of his strongest invective. He protested against the constant flow of English money to Rome and the unwarrantable interference by the Holy See with English Church life at all its levels. He used his wide range of vituperative language on the Papacy after the Great Schism of 1378, '*sicut papa perversus est anticristus atque dyabolus, sic est mendacium in abstracto et pater mendacii*' ('as the evil Pope is anti-Christ and the devil, so he is falsehood itself and the father of lies') (*De Oratione*). The Pope at the worst may not be one of the predestinate at all and at the best can only be the head of a 'particular' church ('*Dominus papa non est caput universalis sed particularis ecclesie*'—'the lord Pope is not the head of a universal but of a particular church') (*De Ecclesia*). In short, Wyclif revolted from most of the practices of the mediæval Church as he saw them working in the day-to-day life of England.

Wyclif's theology was hammered out on the anvil of this revolt. It would be as much an oversimplification to say that his revulsion at the practices of the mediæval Church caused his theology as it would be to state the exact opposite. There is complex interaction between theology and practice. What is plainly true is that the more he recognized and denounced the iniquities of the mediæval Church, both in practice and theory, the more he looked in other directions for his authority. He was rewarded in three ways.

He turned from the Roman Church to the Bible. It has been argued by Professor Deanesly (*The Significance of the Lollard Bible*) that the translation generally attributed to Wyclif, though in fact the work of a school under his leadership, was a word for word construe, useless for illiterates, containing much material unsuitable for pastoral purposes and considerably expensive, and that therefore the motive behind it was not, as has often been supposed, the desirability of every man having access to a translation in his native tongue, but the necessity of possessing in English a sufficient authority for the Christian faith. It would seem that both motives presented themselves to Wyclif. In *De Ecclesia* he argues that every command of the Pope must be tested by the Bible before its acceptance by Christians and adds '*et hoc est racio quare oportet omnem catholicum cognoscere scripturam sacram*' ('and this is the reason why it is necessary for every Catholic to study Holy Scripture'). Certainly he pleaded strongly and often for Bible-reading by the laity. At the same time he looked to the Bible as his supreme authority. *De Veritate Scripturae*, written in 1378 and described by Workman as 'a rambling but uncompromising defence of the absolute inspiration and authority of the Bible', has this to say, '*confirmatur ex hoc, quod tota lex Christi est unum perfectum*

verbum, procedens de ora dei ' (' it is confirmed from this that the whole law of Christ is one perfect word proceeding from the mouth of God '). Everything must be founded upon this ' lex Christi ' . . . ' and (th)us no (th)ing untouchid in (th)is lawe shulde be dun or axid to do ' (*Select English Works*). Wyclif does try to use the Bible himself according to this principle. Usually to prove a point he quotes copiously from the Scriptures (in the *Trialogus* alone there are seven hundred quotations) before turning to the Fathers of the Church. In order that others should do the same he believed that every priest should pass an examination in Biblical knowledge. There is therefore no room to doubt that Wyclif's revolt from the practices and authority of the mediæval Church drove him to the Bible. ' The positive basis which Wycliffe set up in place of absolute Church authority,' wrote G. M. Trevelyan, ' was the Bible.' His theology was Biblical in the sense that whatever he advocated as Christian belief had to be substantiated in ' Goddis lawe,' the final authority.

Mention must here be made of a belief of Wyclif's complementary to his insistence on Biblical authority, namely that the Church should return to the poor and primitive conditions under which she began. He would set aside the traditions of the centuries and get back to Bible days. This was no doubt occasioned by a violent reaction from the secular wealth of the clergy in favour of evangelical poverty. ' *Ex istis colligitur quod summum privilegium concessum christiano pro via foret quod, exproprietarie vivendo, Christo similius foret anterior in exercitu christiano* ' (' From this it is deduced that the highest privilege granted to a Christian along the way is that by living without property, more like Christ, he should be to the fore in the Christian army ') (*De Ecclesia*). That reaction is not a total explanation. The belief was an honest desire to reach Christian truth and ethics as they were at the source, undefiled by the traditions of men. Critics of Wyclif are not slow to voice their disapproval. Dom David Knowles writes of giving ' the go by to all the elaborate framework of ethics and apologetics, to all the mass of speculation and tradition that had gone to make the summa theologica,' and Professor Deanesly contends that a return to a poor and primitive Church would destroy Christianity in the process. However, it can be seen as another sign of Wyclif's devotion to everything associated with the Bible.

The second theological rock on which Wyclif set his feet was the doctrine of predestination. ' John, son of Augustine ' was the title sometimes given to him by his followers, and not without reason. Wyclif increased his respect for the theology of Augustine through the influence of Thomas Bradwardine (d. 1349), a strong determinist and opponent of Pelagianism to whom Wyclif refers as ' Doctor Profundus.' At first there was some element of free will in the theology of Wyclif and he did not go all the way with Bradwardine, who believed that the will of God was responsible for everything, including sin. However, predestination grew on Wyclif. He defined the Church Militant as the total body of the predestinate and asserted that their salvation could not be jeopardized, even by mortal sin. ' *Et sic omnes predestinati habent continue fidem gracia predestinacionis formatam, et sic non cadit a membris ecclesie per mortale* ' (' All the predestinate have continually a faith formed by the grace of predestination and so they do not fall from the membership of the Church through mortal sin ') (*De Ecclesia*). Membership in the organized and visible Church was no guarantee at all of membership in the true Church of the elect. Even the Pope could not count on being numbered with the saints. ' Bot (th)is general holy Chirche is (th)o congregacioun of Crist, (th)at is hed, and alle gode aungels in heven, and alle men and wymmen, in erthe or in purgatorie, (th)at schulen be saved, and no moo ' (*Select English Works*). Unhappily to no one was it given to know whether or not they belonged to this company of ' alle men and wymmen.' They could only live in hope. Macfarlane is quick to see the weakness of this position. . . . ' Was there any reason for believing that Wycliffe himself was one of the elect ? And if not, what followed ? ' (*John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity*). At the same time, as is not unusual in a theology grounded in predestination, Wyclif tried to retain a belief in personal responsibility. ' Eche man shal hope for to come to blisse ; and if he lyve febly and make (th)is hope fals, himsilf is cause whi his hope is suche.' There is, too, and here Wyclif is influenced by Duns Scotus, the inevitable falling back on the inscrutable wisdom of God expressed in his arbitrary decrees and a complementary neglect of the doctrine of the Fall. Wyclif also asserted that there was a category ' Foreknown,' (' presciti '), headed by the devil. ' *Manifestum est quod est unum corpus diaboli, sicut est unum corpus Christi* ' (' It is plain that there is one body of the devil as there is one body of Christ ') (*De Ecclesia*). For these luckless individuals there was no hope. Their head, anti-Christ, had a prominent place in Wyclif's theology, where he was not infrequently identified with the Pope.

The third direction in which Wyclif looked for authority was to the King. His theology included a unique doctrine of Church and State. He believed that as the Pope and his priests were the vicars of Christ so the King was the vicar of God.

' Oportet ergo deum hebere in ecclesia duos vicarios, scilicet regem in temporalibus et sacerdotem in spiritualibus ' (' It is necessary therefore to have in the Church two vicars, clearly the King in things temporal and the priest in things spiritual ') (*De Officio Regis*). In this capacity the King, assisted by his lords and bishops, must rule and, if necessary, reform the Church. *De Officio Regis* contains examples of what Wyclif had in mind. The accumulation of wealth by the Church and the temporalities of the ' Cæsarean clergy ' should be stopped and the treasures put into the King's coffers. The King was to be responsible, through his bishops, for the general moral character of the clergy and he should compel all clerks to study. This rule was not to be subject to ' Christ's pretended Vicar,' the Pope. All excommunications should be made in a joint session of Parliament and Synod, and should carry the right of appeal to the Crown. The weakness of Wyclif's position is clear. It opens the door wide to autocracy and gives enormous power into hands not often fit to wield it. Wyclif wrote about the King, *' quod rex sit ad observantum legiis suis iusticiam strictissime obligatus . . . et quo ad bona virtutis patet quod rex debet esse virtuosior '* (' wherefore the King is obliged to promote righteousness by his laws very strictly . . . and it is clear that in the matter of good conduct the King ought to be more virtuous'). Unfortunately not all kings were like that.

In these directions Wyclif sought the authority with which to replace the rejected authority of the mediæval Church. Bible, predestination and King were the pillars in this theological temple. Mention must now be made of his other notable contribution to theology, his doctrine of the Eucharist.

The doctrine had a philosophic background. As opposed to the nominalism of the Scotists and the conceptualism of Ockham, Wyclif was a realist. He believed in the reality of universals. The nominalist belief that in the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine was annihilated leaving only the accidents, was repugnant to him. Substance, he contended, could not be destroyed. It was in *De Benedicta Incarnacione*, referred to above, that Wyclif began to be disturbed by the theory of annihilation. He made no outrageous statements in the book, merely arguing that there must be an ' essence ' remaining after transubstantiation, about which he says *' sed quoad questionem—quid est de tali essencia ?—non sollicitor '* (' but as regards the question " Of what kind is this essence ? "—I am not concerned ') (*De Benedicta Incarnacione*). This was not a serious deficiency for *' nec est de substancia fidei viatorum scire quid est illa essencia '* (' it is not of the substance of the faith of pilgrims to know what is that essence ') (*De Benedicta Incarnacione*). From this position of philosophic doubt held in 1370 Wyclif did not move until some years later he spoke about ' the mathematical body ' of the bread, but this he later dropped. In so far as he did reach a final position in his eucharistic theology, three things must be said. He believed in the Presence of Christ in the Host. *' Potest ergo dici quod panis et vinum convertuntur principaliter in corpus Christi et sanguinem sed concomitanter et secundarie totam humanitatem Christi '* (' It can therefore be said that bread and wine are converted firstly into the body and blood of Christ, but at the same time and secondarily into the total humanity of Christ ') (*De Eucharistia*). He believed that Christ's body and blood were really and truly present, not corporeally but ' virtually, sacramentally and spiritually.' Trevelyan says, ' He believed the body was in some manner present, though he did not clearly know how.' The elements to Wyclif were not mere signs in the Zwinglian sense but active realities. Next, he believed that ' the substance of material bread remains in the consecrated bread ' (H. B. Workman's translation from *De Blasphemia*). The accidents of bread remain, so must the substance, for *' docet enim racio naturalis quod non potest esse accidens sine subiecto '* (' natural reason teaches that it is not possible to have accidents without substance ') (*De Eucharistia*). This, as we have seen, was due to his realist philosophy. These two beliefs would seem to lead to the theological position of Consubstantiation. Christ is hidden in the Sacrament, but bread still remains bread. ' (Th)is sacrament shulde togedir be bred and Gods body.' As Buddensieg puts it (*Johann Wyclif und seine Zeit*) : ' the sacrament of the altar is Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine.' Thirdly, Wyclif insisted that the Eucharist must be received in faith. There was no magic in the feast. It was not merely a question of ' grinding with the teeth this white round thing consecrated by the priest ' but of the communicant's humble, lowly, penitent and obedient heart. As Loserth expresses it in his Introduction to *De Eucharistia* : ' The Communion of our Lord's body consists, not in the mere bodily reception, touching or eating of the consecrated Host, but in the feeding of the soul upon that faith which brings forth fruit.' About the reception of the Sacrament Wyclif says *' Tria sunt disponencia : Christi dileccio, pax cum proximo et actualis devocio '* (' There are three dispositions : a love of Christ, peace with one's neighbour, and actual devotion ') (*De Eucharistia*). Both Hastings Rashdall and Macfarlane accuse Wyclif of a close approach to ' receptionism ' in which the nature of the Sacrament is made to depend upon the spiritual condition of the recipient. Wyclif's real position is difficult to assess for his doctrine of the Eucharist was still developing at the time of his death.

It will be seen from this brief review that much of John Wyclif's theology anticipated that of the Reformers. The emphasis on Holy Scripture as the supreme authority, the doctrine of predestination, the denial of the transubstantiation miracle of the Mass and a doctrine of Church and State which facilitated the rise of national churches, all these were to emerge again under the great names of the Reformation. To acknowledge this profound contribution to theology and to the life of the Church is not to be blind to the limitations of Wyclif. Much of his earlier work was scholastic in the mediæval sense and had the dead hand of the past upon it. There was a strong pragmatic element in his theology occasioned by the standards of life, particularly clerical life, which had gone uncondemned for so long. In his enthusiasm for the godly life as an antidote to this he could hardly be expected to achieve the delicate balance between faith and works found in later theology. Wyclif never reach the *sola fide* position. Yet, with the limitations imposed by his time and situation, his contribution to the developing theology of the Church was significant.

Paul's Certainties

VIII. The Love of God in Christ—Romans viii. 38, 39

By the Very Reverend George Johnstone Jeffrey, D.D., Glasgow

'I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come. Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

Of a good, humble woman a recent novelist wrote, 'She loved God *as much as she dared*.' There are many such folks. The great, mysterious God inspires in them such tremulous awe and abasement that to aspire to *love* Him seems to border on presumption. A great gulf seems to be fixed between the infinite God and their frail, finite lives and they yearn for the bridging of the gulf. The answer of God to this most human longing is—The Incarnation. We could not come to God. So He came to us in the Person of His Son. And this same Jesus Christ has been loved and served and worshipped by myriads of the best spirits of all time. They loved Him, not merely 'as much as they dared' but to the last capacities of their devotion. Here Paul sets forth at the height of a vast crescendo of argument and experience his fervid conviction that for time and eternity nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. Let us see how far we can corroborate from our own experience, meagre though it be in comparison, Paul's exulting assurance.

He begins with the most divisive power of all—*Death*. We feel instinctively that if that gulf be bridged all lesser barriers may be removed. We would begin by laying down the proposition which experience verifies, that our assurance of immortality is never stronger than when, like Paul, our lives are ardently committed to Christian service. The Apostle Paul had *the right* to feel that the quality of life he was living had in it the earnest of the endless life. And the converse is true. Our assurance of a blessed life beyond this imperfect life never becomes fainter than when we are living wholly for self. Samuel Johnson strikes a deep chord in all our hearts when, looking back on a certain period of his life, he could only say, with sadness—'This is not the kind of life to which heaven is promised.' Not for nothing does the poet put these words into the mouth of an utter worldling to a man of God

To me the thought of death is terrible
  Having such hold on life. To thee
It is no more than is the lifting of a latch,
Only a step into the open air
Out of a tent already luminous
  With light that shines through its transparent walls.

We have all met men and women living such devoted lives that the eternal shines through their mortal self-giving. Robertson of Brighton has described for us such stalwarts for the faith. 'There are men in whom the Resurrection begun, makes the Resurrection credible. In them the Spirit of the Risen Christ works already. They have risen out of the darkness of doubt. They have risen above the narrowness of life and all that is petty and ungenerous and mean. They have risen above fear. They have risen above self.' Among this shining company the Apostle shines supreme. Let us share his consecration and we shall share his impregnable conviction. Ours is no sunless creed that thanks

Whatever gods may be
. . . . . .
That even the weariest river
  Winds somewhere safe to sea

but the experience of the Apostle who knew that the river of his life deepened and widened as it swept on triumphantly to the immortal sea.

Paul's second conviction was that *life itself* could not separate him from the love of God in Christ Jesus his Lord.

The proof of this every Christian ought to be able to furnish from his own experience. Take a turn up and down amid the friendships of your life and mark their history. Distance has wrought havoc with many of our friendships.

> . . . seas between us braid hae roar'd
> Sin' auld lang syne.

Then some of our friendships seem to have died a natural death. We have simply outgrown them. Our friend has given us all he could give *us*. We have given him all it was in our power to give *him*. Then of course there are the sad estrangements that separate us, often the bitter fruit of a hasty word or an ungovernable mood. On the other hand, some of us will never cease to thank God for a friendship that began in our school days and has become richer and more lovely with the years. What is all this train of thought leading to but the exulting conception of the *Constant Christ*? That surely is the ideal Christian life which began as children in a godly home, trained by parents who made it easy for us to believe in goodness and in God, and has survived, strong and ever more exulting, over all the changes and chances of time, so that from our heart of hearts we can thank God

> Who from our mother's arms
> Hath blessed us on our way
> With countless gifts of love
> *And still is ours to-day.*

The Apostle felt coursing through his veins the risen life of Christ Himself, making him shock-proof against the worst that life could bring. Again be it said that to share Paul's assurance we must share his utter devotion.

Again Paul mentions as possible agents of separation from the love of God in Christ Jesus—*angels and principalities and powers*. The phrase recalls vividly another statement of the Apostle in his Letter to the Ephesians. 'We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.' On such 'principalities and powers' the scholars have shown us that Paul shared the thought of his own time, that there were at work in the world and in the human heart, insidious, unsleeping, uncanny, seemingly omnipotent forces of evil. Without solving the difficult problems of interpretation here involved, is there one of us such a stranger to his own heart as to be ignorant of these eerie, subtle, perilous powers that often people our imagination and seek relentlessly to undermine our moral defences? George Eliot has a saying 'It is a favourite stratagem of our passions to sham a retreat and then to turn sharp round upon us when we think that the day is our own.' She gives a striking instance of this in *Adam Bede*, where she depicts a youth enmeshed in the toils of temptation, providing himself with an alibi that he may be absent from the onset of evil and then, to his own horror, galloping back to be at the time and scene of desperate danger.

Now Paul's antidote to humiliations like these can also be shared by all who emulate him in a life of abundant service. Not only is the fully preoccupied life the truly joyous life, it is the *safe* life. How significantly does the prophet say of the highway of holiness 'No lion shall be there.' It is not on the plain path of honour and duty that temptation waits and lurks, but in the jungle of day-dreaming and fantasy. Paul knew that when he was busy and vigilant for God, God would be vigilant for him, safeguarding and preserving him for his life-work. Which of us but could give from some vivid experience an example of God's solicitude for us when, as far as we know our own heart, our one motive was the doing of His holy will? As has been aptly said, 'It is not as you stride on in the darkness that you know the peril. It is when you go back at dawn and see the footprints by the cliff's edge.' These are the situations where we learn that 'He that keepeth us slumbers not not sleeps.'

Nor things present, nor things to come—this present age nor any future age. These also shall not be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

It is thrilling to think of the place of Paul in the context of his time, in a world dominated by Rome with its culture and cruelty, its heterogeneous forms of faith, its seething problems of master and slave, its stranglehold on the liberties of subjugated nationalities, and against this to set the lonely figure of the Apostle, the bond-slave of Christ, the depository of a faith that would survive the might of Rome itself, a kingdom built not on force but on something not seen with the eyes nor grasped with the hand, something filmy, incalculable, imponderable yet indestructible—redemptive Divine love. Of its survival to the end of the ages Paul never for a moment entertained a doubt. The rock of his confidence was that Christ 'knew what was in man,' as no other could ever know. He knew the eternal needs of the human heart. Heaven and earth might pass away but His words would never pass away. There would never come a time when the strange spell of Christ on the heart of man would ever lose its hold.

Nor height nor depth. The metaphors are astronomical but the implications are spiritual. A flashlight on such language comes from C. E. Lewis' *Screwtape Letters*, a book that tells us far more about these strange hearts of ours than we could have discovered for ourselves. He tells us that the nearest approach to constancy in our experience is *undulation*, 'the repeated return to a level from which we repeatedly fall back, a series of troughs and peaks, adding for our comfort that some of God's special favourites have gone through longer and deeper troughs than anyone else.' If ever a man knew heights and depths in life it was the Apostle Paul. He had his great moments of spiritual exaltation when, thrilled and awed by the effects in human life of Christ's redeeming love he could only exclaim 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!' And alternating with these high seasons there came times of heartrending anxiety. There were, for instance, 'the things that happened to him in Asia'—all the more awesome because we are not given the exact details, when even a man like Paul could say, 'This is the end,' only to find once more, as so often in his tumultuous career, that man's extremity was God's opportunity.

Or any other creature. 'Or anything that can possibly happen to me'—this shall not separate me from the love of God in Christ Jesus. He had been taught by the past that he need fear nothing in the future. There is a great stabilizing text in the Psalms—'He shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.' Such was the central calm in the mind of St. Paul as he faced the uncertain future. Only the events were uncertain. The love of God in Christ nothing could touch. It is a big thing to be able to say that nothing in the future can daunt us. Strangely enough more people than we imagine are haunted with the fear of 'the last lap' in the race. It was for this reason that a great Victorian statesman refused to have his biography written in his lifetime. In my early ministry one unforgettable memory was the sight of a wealthy old man pacing the grounds of his wide estate, burdened with the belief that he would die bankrupt. When his will was made public, it was seen that his fears were utterly groundless. When the lamp of our faith burns low, let us borrow a light from great souls like the Apostle and we shall know of a truth that

> His grace will *to the end*
> Stronger and brighter shine;
> Nor present things nor things to come
> Shall quench the spark divine.

Literature

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE

The Rev. A. R. C. Leaney, M.A., B.D., Lecturer in Christian Theology in the University of Nottingham, has contributed a useful, suggestive, and somewhat provocative volume, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (A. and C. Black; 25s. net), to the series known as 'Black's New Testament Commentaries'. He attempts to assess the character and value of the Third Gospel as the work of a theologian who is also a historian. He recognizes that the idea of Luke as a theologian would have been an impossible conception to the scholars of a generation ago, but maintains that this understanding of his status, with ideas peculiarly his own, is now common, so that the inevitable corollary is a question: how far may he still be regarded as a historian?

In the section on Introduction Mr. Leaney discusses the relevant questions, the Author and the Writing of the Gospel, Luke and his Sources, and Luke's theology. A valuable sub-section gives Special Notes on Particular Subjects and Passages, including the Holy Spirit in Luke, John the Baptist, Angels, the Census, Chronology and the Identification of Officials, and such topics as the Rejection at Nazareth; the Call of Peter; Jesus, the child and the children; the text of the Lord's Prayer; 'the days of the Son of Man'; and a defence and interpretation of the Shorter Text in the narrative of the Institution of the Eucharist. This arrangement is a useful compensation for the brevity of the Commentary proper, to which some two hundred and twenty pages are allotted, of which a third consists of Mr. Leaney's translation of the Greek text.

This arrangement, for which of course Mr. Leaney is not responsible, means that only laconic comments are possible as, for example, the note on Lk 21^{20} in which Mr. Leaney dismisses C. H. Dodd's learned note in 'The Journal of Roman Studies', xxxvii. 47–54, with the statement: 'There is no need to see evidence here for a separate source'. Similarly in the Introduction Proto-Luke is liquidated in five lines on the ground that its 'lack of an Apocalypse or a Passion Narrative would deprive it of all claim

to be called a gospel'; as if its protagonists ever claimed that it was 'a gospel'!

It is pleasing to record that against strong tendencies in some quarters, Mr. Leaney affirms his belief in the Evangelist's use of Q. He also outlines a very interesting hypothesis regarding the origin of the Infancy narratives, in which he suggests that the Evangelist used two sources, in one of which there was no hint of a miraculous conception; and further he supports the hypothesis of J. N. Sanders that the authors of the Third and Fourth Gospels had access independently to the same tradition, accepting among other things the authenticity on textual grounds of Lk 24^{12} and ^{40}. The most challenging feature in the commentary is the extent to which he presents Luke as a theologian. It must be confessed, however, that apart from Luke's interest in the Holy Spirit, he appears to make too much of the emphasis laid in the Gospel upon the Kingship of Jesus, since *βασιλεύς* is used of Jesus only five times, thrice in the derisory phrase 'the king of the Jews', although it is true that $1^{32f.}$ 'the throne of David his father' is mentioned. In general, one has the feeling that the theologian's robe with which the Evangelist is invested sits awkwardly upon him and tends to hide the historian's quill which in fact is his distinguishing endowment. At the same time much gratitude is due to the author for a penetrating study in a commentary which has the supreme merit of compelling the reader to look at the Third Gospel from a new angle.

VINCENT TAYLOR

R.S.V. OF THE APOCRYPHA

The Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has lost no time in following up the publication of the Revised Standard Version of the Old and New Testaments by a new revision of the Apocrypha—*The Apocrypha of the Old Testament:* Revised Standard Version. Translated from the Greek and Latin Tongues being the Version set forth A.D. 1611 revised A.D. 1894 compared with the Most Ancient Authorities and Revised A.D. 1957 (Nelson; 18s. net). The translators have followed the same principles and procedure as were adopted for the Revised Standard Version, with the same aim of producing a revision of the former English Versions, 'in diction designed for use in public and private worship', and seeking to preserve the great qualities of the King James Version, while at the same time embodying in the revised translation the best results of modern scholarship. In addition to the King James Version of the Apocrypha and the English Revised Version of 1894, some use has also been made of Goodspeed's Version of 1938.

The task was entrusted to a distinguished panel of translators under the Chairmanship of Dean Luther A. Weigle, formerly of Yale University; it included scholars of both Old and New Testaments, some of them former members of the Committee responsible for the R.S.V. of the Old and New Testaments, Millar Burrows, H. J. Cadbury, F. C. Grant, C. T. Craig (who died in 1953), along with, as new members, B. M. Metzger, Robert H. Pfeiffer, A. P. Wikgren, F. V. Filson and J. C. Swaim.

The basic Greek text adopted is the edition of the LXX of Alfred Rahlfs, and standard modern editions have been used for the Latin Apocrypha, supplemented by consultation of the ancient Oriental Versions. For the first time in an official revision the Hebrew fragments of Ben Sirach, discovered at the end of the nineteenth century, have been utilised. Throughout, the translators have given careful consideration to variant readings, not only those in Rahlfs' apparatus; and those portions of the Apocrypha preserved in Papyri have also been collated.

The result is a first-rate scholarly production in which the fullest use has been made of new material and of the best results of modern scholarship. The use of the Hebrew text of Ben Sirach is a special feature of the revision; obscurities in the Greek are cleared up by reference to what is manifestly the original Hebrew text (for example, at 31^{5} '[He who loves gold will not be justified], and he who pursues money will be lead astray by it' replacing the unintelligible Greek text 'will be filled by it'). It is not surprising to find that, time and again, it is the Hebrew text, where extant, which underlies the translation, the Greek reading being found in the margin. No doubt the Hebrew fragments of Tobit found at Qumran will prove, when they become available, just as important. The inclusion of significant variant readings to the readings of the text is also a welcome and useful feature of the revision.

The English translation itself, since it is a revision and not a new translation, still retains the flavour of the older English Versions, and, with the Revision Version as a basis, inevitably something too of the scholarly precision of the nineteenth century revisers; the translation has little of the raciness and vigour of the late Monsignor Knox's Version of the Apocrypha. But this is only to say that it is a revision and not a new translation; and it is a revision which takes a worthy place beside the R.S.V. of the Old and the New Testaments.

M. BLACK

THE TEMPTATION

Between God and Satan, by Professor Helmut Thielicke (Oliver and Boyd; 10s. 6d. net) is a forceful, even poignant, study of the Temptation of Jesus. It is not, however, primarily a piece of academic New Testament exegesis, but rather an endeavour to awaken in the reader a deeper understanding of the grim struggle in which we, too, as well as our Lord, are involved.

The book was first written in Germany in 1938, and there are pages which reflect the tragic issues which confronted our fellow-Christians in those days, when National Socialism was demanding from all German citizens completely unlimited obedience, sometimes working through terrifying threats, and sometimes through disarming blandishments. The book sprang to life, therefore, in days when Christians were living under the harrow. It has, however, a wider application to the Christian life in all times and circumstances, and for this reason the book was re-issued in 1945, and now has been translated into English—uncommonly well—by the Rev. C. C. Barber, M.A., D.Phil.

The book reveals on every page a vivid twofold awareness, awareness of the vast, sinister power of evil which broods over the world of men, and an awareness, too, of the unchanging right of God, man's rightful Lord, to receive from him complete obedience. Man is the battlefield where these two powers engage in ceaseless conflict.

The author writes as one disillusioned about the validity of man's rational arguments, whether to undermine or to establish faith in God. 'The tempter takes hold of him through his concrete life, and not through sophisticated theoretical arguments'. Satan seeks to gain power over him by many devices, through his terror of standing alone, isolated from his fellows, and through his anxious need for security. He can use even his faith to overthrow him. As Christ was tempted to evil by the sneer: 'If thou art the Son of God . . .', so, too, the Christian may be goaded into un-Christian conduct by the sneer: 'If you count yourself a Christian, surely. . . .'. By challenging Christ to justify His belief in Himself as Son of God by an action unauthorised by God, Satan was in fact subtly seeking to dictate what Christ should do.

The author has strong words to say about Christians who value the comforts of Christian experience more highly than the discipline of obedience to God's will, who 'do not desire to exist for God, but think that God should exist for them', who 'praise the gift of God instead of the Giver', who worship 'the help instead of the helper, the medicine instead of the physician, the bread instead of the Father who cares for us'. This is idolatry. So, too, is the attitude of those who imagine that they can put God under an obligation to them, and dare to say: 'God owes it to me to do this for me'.

In days of calm and comfortable life, we can grade evil into various degrees of grey. But in this urgent book we see only sharply contrasted blacks and whites, Satan and God, and, in between, man, continuously confronted with decisive choice between the two. It is a moving book, with many insights into our Lord's bitter struggle and many insights, too, into our own temptations, and the devilish devices by which evil seeks to overpower us and seduce us from our primary duty of unfaltering obedience to God.

C. L. MITTON

NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

All the good things written by Dr. Niven in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvii. 136f. about Dr. William Barclay's 'New Testament Wordbook' can be said again of *More New Testament Words* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net). Here twenty-four words, with cognates, are treated, beginning with *agapē* and ending with *splagchnizesthai*—how ugly in transliteration—the Divine Compassion; and ranging from over a dozen pages on Love to a couple on 'many coloured' chosen for Peter's inspired use of it to describe the grace of God. As may be expected Dr. Barclay exerts all his skill and resource on the exposition of *agapē* so that the reader who is prepared to follow through all the references can gain the larger part of what heretofore was reserved for the student of Kittel. Among many happy touches is the use made of *enteuxis*—intercession, prayer—showing its technical use as a petition to a king and so evoking 'a tremendous picture. When we pray we are in the position of those who have undisputed access that they may bring their petitions to the king. When we pray it is to a king we come. Therein is set forth at once both the tremendous privilege of prayer, and the tremendous power of prayer'. Much has been said, and rightly so, of Dr. Barclay's great services to the common man. A word should be added of the debt to him of the trained minister. Here he offers pattern and object lesson of what can be done by using three books: the Greek Testament (preferably the 1958 edition of the Bible Society); the Lexicon (preferably Arndt and Gingrich); and the Concordance (preferably Moulton and Geden).

A few months ago the present reviewer when preparing a note on New Testament Commentaries was hard put to find suitable recommendations for the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The

lack of sound guidance here is all the more grievous in respect of the difficulty of the Epistle. Within a few weeks came an admirable treatment by J. Héring in the new series of Delachaux and Niestlé. Now, for the English reader, Professor R. V. G. Tasker has added to his distinguished editorial work his own 'Tyndale' volume—*The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale Press; 8s. 6d. net). Those who read the author's article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 55ff., will not be surprised that he holds fast to the integrity of the Epistle, relying on the strong external evidence, and rejects the internal persuasions, based on content, as to the location of 6^{14}–7^{1} and 10–13. In the course of the arguments he challenges some of the pre-suppositions behind Dr. Mitton's 'Formation of the Pauline Corpus'. The acceptance of the unity of the Epistle naturally reacts on the treatment of the content. The exposition is clear, forceful, and conservative. Some may wonder that no consideration has been given to recent suggestions as to the reading and punctuation of $3^{17f.}$ (Héring is particularly good here) but as always Professor Tasker abides by the textual evidence and refuses to have any truck with the *cacoethes corrigendi*. There can be no doubt that, granted his presuppositions, which some will find it easier to accept than others, Professor Tasker has supplied a real need, especially for the reader of the English versions, in a competent and helpful way.

In *Galatians: The Charter of Christian Liberty* (Pickering and Inglis; 15s. net) Dr. Merrill C. Tenney of Wheaton College, Illinois, offers a new means for the study of the Epistle by approaching the text through ten 'methods', for example, Synthetic, Critical, Comparative, Devotional, etc. The result is often interesting but somewhat uneven. The book raises many questions and answers some.

The Rev. Rupert E. Davies of Didsbury College has published the substance of a series of broadcasts on the Epistle to the Philippians in *A Colony of Heaven* (Epworth Press; 5s. net; school edition in limp covers; 3s. 6d. net). Here is good exposition, admirably arranged for instruction and fortified by a number of well-chosen questions for discussion.

MARCUS WARD

UNLOCKING THE RIDDLES OF THE REVELATION

There is no lack of great commentaries on the Revelation. The mind immediately turns to the commentaries of R. H. Charles, H. B. Swete, and J. T. Beckwith in English; but the characteristic of these commentaries is that they are on the Greek text; and sometimes they are so elaborate and present the reader with so many different interpretations that they leave him more puzzled than when he began to read. It is for that reason that we welcome with enthusiasm *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary for Laymen*, by Professor Thomas S. Kepler, D.D., Ph.D. (Oxford University Press; 30s. net).

In the Introduction Dr. Kepler displays an enviable gift of lucid analysis and orderly and concise arrangement. As an example of this we summarize Dr. Kepler's analysis of the difference between *Prophecy* and *Apocalyptic*. Prophecy is theistic in that in it God is both immanent and transcendent; apocalyptic is deistic in that God is divorced from any intimate contact with the world. In prophecy God is not limited by any second power in the universe; in apocalyptic there is in the universe another power, Satan, the power of darkness and of evil, a power which contends with God for the loyalties of men, and which is as yet undefeated. In prophecy, since God is already intimately close to men, there is no need of any further intermediaries between God and man; in apocalyptic, since God is altogether transcendent, there are angels and demons between man and Him. In prophecy God's Kingdom can take place within history and within the world; apocalyptic is entirely pessimistic and believes this world to be so evil that it can only be destroyed and a new universe created. In prophecy the coming Messiah comes from an earthly heredity, of the line of David; in apocalyptic the Messiah is a divine, supramundane figure invading the world from outside.

Equally concise and illuminating is Dr. Kepler's summary of the characteristics of the author of the Revelation, as they are revealed to us in the book itself. (1) He is a Jew, so well versed in the Old Testament that he quotes it two hundred and forty-five times. (2) He probably learned Greek late in life and he still thinks in Hebrew. (3) He is a distinguished Church leader whose writ runs throughout all the seven churches. (4) He is a deeply religious man with perfect faith in the triumph of God over the demonic forces of the world. (5) He is a literary genius of the first order.

On the whole Dr. Kepler does not bewilder the reader by citing a multitude of interpretations Normally he very intelligently and carefully chooses one. In Rev 13 the beast from the sea is the power of the Roman Empire and its Cæsar worship; the beast from the land is the organization of priests and administrators who organize and enforce Cæsar worship in Asia Minor. Dr. Kepler is interesting on the number 666 (Rev 13^{18}). The number has been taken to stand for

Muhammad, Luther, Napoleon, Hitler, Pope Benedict IX, Mussolini, Kaiser Wilhelm. The Hitler interpretation is interesting. Let A=100; B=101; C=102; D=103; and so on. Then H=107; I=108; T=119; L=111; E=104; R=117; and the total is 666! Almost certainly the number 666 stands for Nero. If we take the word in Latin and give the letters their normal numerical equivalents we get N=50; E=6; R=500; O=60; N=50; and the sum is 666. A similar result can be obtained by taking the numerical value of the letters in Hebrew.

We are quite certain that for the person who has no Greek at his disposal this is by far the best commentary on the Revelation. We only wish that it was cheaper so that it could be the more widely circulated, for this is a commentary which is well equipped to introduce sanity into the study of a book which has been for too long the playground of the eccentrics of religion.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

OTHER RELIGIONS

Unlike the majority of books on the history and comparative study of religion this volume—*Religions: A Preliminary Historical and Theological Study*, by the Rev. D. W. Gundry (Macmillan; 16s. net)—is written quite openly from the Christian point of view for the instruction of theological students, the clergy and ministers of religion, teachers and their more advanced pupils in the sixth forms, and for educated laymen. The purpose being to enable practising Christians to acquire a general knowledge of the religions of mankind, and to relate their beliefs and customs to their own faith and practice, technicalities have been avoided and every effort has been made to make the subject intelligible to the non-specialist.

After a short consideration of the nature and significance of religion, the origins of the discipline are discussed in their rudimentary phases and from the psychological and sociological standpoints. This inquiry follows along the usual lines, in which the familiar names of Comte, Tylor, Robertson Smith, Frazer, Marett, Schmidt, Durkheim and Freud recur in their customary rôles. In ch. 3 a very well-informed summary is made of the rise and development of religion in the ancient civilizations in Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Indus Valley, the Aegean and the Graeco-Roman world. If an inherent monotheism is rather overstressed as a recurrent element almost everywhere, to have compressed into thirty-six pages the salient features of this complex phase in the history of religion from the fifth millennium B.C. to the Christian era is no small achievement. It is a pity that it is followed by a very short chapter on the magico-religious cults in primitive society and in Shinto, which, besides being too sketchy to do justice to the subject, breaks the sequence in the development of the higher faiths.

After this interlude Taoism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Jainism, and Buddhism are brought together under a common heading of 'Monistic Religions.' While the fundamental tenets of each of them are very adequately surveyed in so small a compass, it is putting too great a strain on the term 'monism' to comprehend under this designation the mystical interpretations of Tao, the theism of Ramanuja, the polytheism of the Veda, the atheism of Jainism and Buddhism (with their dualistic backgrounds), the Mahayana sects in China and Japan, and the syncretisms in Hinduism since the sixteenth century of our era, in addition to the genuine Vedantic and Upanishadic monisms.

Finally, the monotheistic religions—Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Islam and Christianity—are briefly discussed, the unique character of the Christian revelation and the centrality of Christ being steadfastly maintained. Christianity, it is affirmed, is 'the most to be reckoned with. The person of Christ, therefore, presents each of us,' it is said, 'with a personal problem on which he cannot escape decision.' On this note of challenge a very worth-while survey of the religions of the world in a theological setting is brought to an end. For the readers for whom it is intended the book fulfils its purpose admirably.

E. O. JAMES

DEAN INGE AS PREACHER

The late Professor R. H. Lightfoot of Oxford collected over a period of fifty years through a press-cutting agency every utterance of Dean Inge which appeared in newspapers or periodicals. This varied and bountiful collection was bequeathed to Prebendary A. F. Judd, D.D., who shared with his one-time tutor at Wells College, Dr. Lightfoot, a profound admiration for the author. Out of the collection Dr. Judd has selected and edited for publication twenty-two sermons, which now appear under the title, *W. R. Inge, Goodness and Truth* (Mowbray; 13s. 6d. net).

For the student of the period in which Dr. Inge lived and taught Lightfoot's collection will be a valuable source book; this sermonic selection from it by Dr. Judd is presented 'to reintroduce to the present generation' one who has an assured place among 'the eminent preachers of the English Church.' The twofold fruit of pious devotion to

the memory of Dean Inge will assuredly be appreciated by many.

During his life-time Dr. Inge published six volumes of sermons, and it may well be that few of these are available now. If so, the present volume will be all the more welcome. It is a sermonic selection of great variety, concerned all through with central things in doctrine, in Christian character, in the meaning of faith, in the mystery and the burden of life, and in the grounds and range of Christian hope. The characteristics of Dean Inge's mind and pen, familiar to all who know any of his writings, come forth also in these sermons. There is no attempt here at what is called popular preaching, no avoidance of declaring uncomfortable truth, no refusal of the call for intellectual honesty. Yet there is a moving simplicity in the thought and the expression. Perhaps of all the other sermonic volumes that entitled ' Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion ' [1924] has most kinship with the spirit informing Dr. Judd's selection. None can read these strong and often tender discourses without the awareness at the end that in Dean Inge himself the life of faith was lived at both an exacting and a happy depth. The value of this book receives much addition from the gracious memoir of Dean Inge which Dr. Matthews, the present Dean of St. Paul's, has permitted to appear as an introductory chapter.

JOHN MACLEOD

A THEOLOGY OF ELECTION

An important book by a Hebrew Christian, marked by great learning and deep earnestness is Dr. Jakób Jocz's *A Theology of Election* (S.P.C.K. ; 25s. net). The author is profoundly conscious that he is a Jew and a Christian, and he argues for the solidarity of the Hebrew Christian with his Jewish brethren, even though he is repudiated by them. He examines the meaning of election in both Old and New Testaments, and maintains that the election of Israel is irrevocable. At the same time he recognises that the election is limited to those who respond to the grace of God, and also that Israel may include some who are Gentiles according to the flesh, but who come to share the response called for from Israel.

Throughout, the book revolves round the two poles of Israel and the Church. After examining the nature and faith of the Church and of the Synagogue the author reviews the dialogue between Church and Synagogue, and the relation of both to Election. The book has upon it the stamp of an *Apologia pro vita sua*, and this gives it at times a moving quality. At the same time it is a scholarly work deserving of serious attention, and an earnest effort to grapple with the theological problems inherent in the concept of election.

This does not mean that it is beyond criticism. Few books are. At times there is what appears to be special pleading. Thus the author protests against the early Christian view that ' the Jews ' had rejected and crucified Christ, and insists that it was merely a crowd of individual Jews who were responsible. Yet elsewhere he argues—and rightly—that every Christian to-day should feel his own personal share in the crucifixion of Christ. As Dr. Jocz says that it is the view of Jews to-day that the rejection of Jesus at His crucifixion was final, it is hard to see how he can deny the solidarity of the Jews with the crucifiers of Jesus and at the same time affirm the solidarity of the Church with those crucifiers. All this might have been expressed more satisfactorily. It is true that the crucifixion of Jesus should not be used as a taunt against the Jews, as it was once. But it is also true that for Jew and Gentile the measure of solidarity with the crucifiers of Jesus is the measure of rejection of the claims and the way of Christ.

H. H. ROWLEY

The veteran American philosopher, Professor William Ernest Hocking, has turned to prophecy and has sought to discern the nature of the single world civilization which is now emerging. An essential part of such looking forward is an estimate of the future of the great religions. Hocking seems to envisage a gradual drawing together of the faiths in which Christianity would lose its life in order to find it. Christianity, he thinks, is in need of reconception through a deeper and humbler intercourse with the soul of the East in its agelong acceptance of a searching self-discipline. Readers of this journal will not readily accept the dilution of the uniqueness of Christianity involved in this, but they may still profit from the writer's shrewd insights expounded in *The Coming World Civilization* (Allen and Unwin ; 16s. net).

Professor Thomas F. Torrance of New College, Edinburgh, deserves thanks for editing the famous Sermons on the Sacrament preached by Robert Bruce in 1589 in the Kirk of Edinburgh. They are now published as *The Mystery of the Lord's Supper* (James Clarke ; 15s. net). The degenerate church-goer of to-day might find these sermons somewhat heavy ; but the careful reader will be amply repaid. Professor Torrance has added a helpful introduction which illumines the career and character of Bruce and lays stress on his proclamation of the doctrine of union with

Christ and our participation in His saving and sanctifying humanity.

A dozen years ago, J. B. Levner issued in Hebrew the first volume of the Rabbinical and popular Legends of Israel. A second has now appeared, and like its predecessor has been translated into English by Mr. Joel Snowman—*The Legends of Israel* (James Clarke ; 12s. 6d. net). This volume covers the life of Moses. All peoples have delighted in decorating and filling in details of the lives of their heroes, and Israel was no exception. There are blanks in the canonical annals and imagination proceeded to fill them in. Those legends were transmitted from one generation to another—in the home, in the synagogue, in children's play. They did not exist in written form till Talmud and Midrash appeared. Many of the hundred and fifty-eight legends here before us have little intrinsic interest, being just the canonical stories somewhat embellished. A group, however, deals with the section of Moses' life about which Scripture is almost barren of information. From Exodus we gather that Moses fleeing from Egypt spent forty years with Jethro. Not so according to the legends. At the age of twenty-seven Moses became King of Cush and ruled there for forty years. Then he went to Midian but Jethro, suspicious as to why so able a man should be a vagabond, flung him into a dungeon for ten years till Zipporah who secretly had fed him procured his release. Then comes an incident with many parallels in folklore ; Jethro had a magic staff in his garden and promised his daughter to whomsoever could drag it from the ground. Moses was successful.

We are told how Balaam, his two sons and eight brothers, were the magicians in Pharaoh's court.

As to the death of Moses, we learn that God sent angel after angel to bring the soul of Moses to Him. None of them succeeded in convincing Moses that the moment of departure had come. So God Himself came down and with a kiss drew the soul of Moses from his body.

These examples of the legends must suffice.

Not for a moment does Levner think that in the legends is history with any factual value. His hope is that by the tales young Israel will be led to appreciate their great national hero to whom civilization as we know it owes so much.

An excellent addition has been made to ' The Teach Yourself Books ' by Mr. Jack Finegan in his *Christian Theology* (English Universities Press ; 6s. net). It aims at instructing the laymen in what Christian theology essentially contains as to God, Jesus Christ, the Church, human duty and destiny. It is clearly and simply written, technical terms have been reduced to a minimum. The author's own view is that of orthodox Protestantism ; the authority of Scripture especially the record of the teaching and acts of Jesus is primary, yet our knowledge of God's working is augmented by all that science can teach. Throughout there are apt short quotations from many writers. This book is a *multum in parvo* which will meet the undoubted need of those both inside and outside the churches who are uncertain what a modern theologian really believes, and how he can give reasons for the faith that is in him.

In *Shadows Fall Apart,* by Mr. J. C. Pollock (Hodder and Stoughton ; 12s. 6d. net), we read the truly inspiring story of the Zenana Bible and Medical Mission—now, since 1957, the Bible and Medical Missionary Fellowship—an interdenominational society which has for over a hundred years carried on work among women and children in various districts of Western, Eastern, and Northern India, and is still vigorously active. Mr. Pollock skilfully sets forth a story which is rich in striking incident and human interest. The general pattern is, of course, not unfamiliar —pioneers in the heroic mould whose first courageous efforts in evangelism are here and there rewarded by equally courageous response—extremities of human need and suffering which constrain the pioneers or their immediate successors to establish hospitals, orphanages, homes for lepers, in addition to the schools which are often their first concern—widening influence, expanding institutions, increasing expenditure, and an income which is never quite adequate even to the immediate need. When we come to the twenties and the thirties and the forties of this century, there is much discussion of retrenchment, reorganization, Indian leadership, integration with the Indian Church. But, appropriately enough, the last word is of pioneering once more, in the hitherto closed land of Nepal.

If this were the proper place for the discussion of policy, one might query the desirability of the continued separate existence of large numbers of smallish missionary societies—their multitude creates serious problems for Christianity in the India of to-day—and one might be constrained to join issue with this particular society regarding its apparently rigid Fundamentalist position. But in a brief notice of Mr. Pollock's interesting narrative the main word should be of gratitude and admiration for a hundred years of faithful adventuring for Christ.

Highways, Hedges and Factories, by Canon E. Moore Darling (Longmans ; 10s. 6d. net), is most certainly worth reading.

Before Canon Moore Darling became a Canon Missioner he had a lengthy experience as a parish priest. He was haunted by the failure of the Church to make any real contact with ordinary people. The Church, as he sees it, is spending ninety per cent. of its time on ten per cent. of the people in this country. That is a situation which clearly cannot continue. Canon Moore Darling quotes the pungent saying of one of his friends: 'We shall only be able to provide the unconverted with spiritual necessities when we cut down the spiritual luxuries lavished on the converted'. The motto on the title page of this book is: 'If the Mountain won't come to Muhammad, then Muhammad must go to the Mountain'. And this book is the humble and sincere record of Canon Moore Darling's own experiments in reaching the people who will not come to Church.

He tells of his experience as a factory chaplain, and in experiments in all kinds of parishes in the Diocese of Coventry. One of the lovely features of this book is the writer's humility. Never at any time does he tell his brethren what to do; he simply shares his successes—and his failures. Another of this book's attractions is the writer's bubbling sense of humour. He tells of an experience in a factory. 'My normal "Factory Day" is Wednesday, but owing to pressure of work, I'd gone on Tuesday for two successive weeks. As I approached his bench, a large man, apparently very annoyed, said fiercely, "For goodness' sake make up your mind which *is* non-swearing day. We don't know if it's Tuesday or Wednesday" '. The same man became one of his staunchest supporters.

This is a book at once challenging and helpful. It is introduced by a Foreword from the Bishop of Coventry.

How can the modern preacher discover a means whereby his preaching will become really powerful and effective? In his latest book—*Prophetic Preaching: A New Approach* (Abingdon Press; $2.50 net)—Professor Otto J. Baab (Garrett Biblical Institute, Chicago) finds the solution in a study of the call and career of the Old Testament prophet. Thus the 'new approach' is a revival of our awareness of God's approach. Their passion and zeal arose from a clear call direct from God, not a once-for-all call, but a continuous call, 'new every morning with the sun,' so to speak. Without effective preaching of the Word of God, such modern necessities as skill in administration, psychology, worship and social graces are mostly irrelevant. Dr. Baab discusses and analyses the lives of the prophets, shows where and how these details apply to modern times, and thus seeks to encourage the preacher to witness convincingly to God's saving power and to preach Christ crucified. The book should indeed encourage many.

We give a warm welcome to *The Church Redemptive*, by Professor Howard Grimes (Abingdon Press; $3.50 net). It falls into two parts—the Nature of the Church and the Mission of the Laity. In the first the author concludes that the Church in its essential nature is both of God and of man. While coming to us as a gift, it must also be accepted with a sense of obligation. It must be a redemptive fellowship in order to draw persons into a redemptive relation to Christ, but it cannot be such a fellowship except as individuals have responded personally to the redemptive love of God. In the second part indications are given of what the work of the Church should be if it is to express its Divine nature and mission in the world. We commend particularly the chapter on Group Life within the Fellowship.

This is a thought-provoking book, alive to recent discussion of such topics and relevant in principle to all lands, though some illustrations may apply especially to the U.S.A.

They Teach Us to Pray, by the Rev. Reginald E. O. White, M.A., B.D. (Arthur James; 12s. 6d. net), is a book written on an unusual plan. Its sub-title is *A Biographical ABC of the Prayer Life*. Its method may be indicated by a quotation of certain of its chapter headings: 'Abraham, the Argument of Prayer', 'Moses, the Benefit of Prayer', 'Joshua, the Condition of Prayer', 'Gideon, the Daring of Prayer', and so on through most of the alphabet.

Mr. White holds that 'prayer is best learned through fellowship with those who pray'. He, therefore, goes on to say: 'It follows that any study of prayer, if it is to be adequate, practical, and helpful, must be biographical'.

The book is full of good things. When God called Moses to his great task, Moses sought every way to evade that task on the score of his own inadequacy for it, until, as Mr. White has it, the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses 'whose absorption in his own insufficiencies was threatening to become a hindrance to God's purpose'. Later Moses was to ask God to show him the way he should go, and God's answer was: 'My presence shall go with thee'. Mr. White's admirable comment is: 'He asked instruction, but he gets companionship'.

This book will supply the preacher with a most excellent and compellingly interesting series of sermons, and it will deepen and strengthen the prayer-life of all who read it. There is an appreciative Foreword by Dr. F. Townley Lord.

The Interpretation of I Peter iii. 19 and iv. 6[1]

By the Reverend C. E. B. Cranfield, M.A., The University of Durham

I

That 1 P 3^{18-22} contains material taken from an early Christian creed or hymn seems likely; but those who hold this view differ as to the limits of the quotation. According to H. Windisch[2] the whole passage is a baptismal hymn consisting of four strophes, the exhortation contained in *vv.* 13–17 being continued in 4^{1}. According to O. Cullmann[3] we have in *vv.* 18, 19, 21c and 22 a confession of faith dealing with the death of Jesus, His descent into Hades, His resurrection, ascension and session at the right hand of God, in the middle of which the author of the Epistle has inserted a brief instruction on baptism (*vv.* 20, 21ab). According to F. L. Cross,[4] the creed consists of *vv.* 18, 21c and 22. R. Bultmann[5] is more adventuresome and reconstructs a creed (in which he detects Gnostic influence) as follows:

(? I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ,)
who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of
of the world,
but was manifested at the end of the times;
who suffered for sins once,
that He might bring us to God.
Being put to death in the flesh,
but quickened in the spirit,
in which also He preached unto the spirits in prison,
(and) having gone into heaven, He sat down on
the right hand of God,
angels and authorities and powers being made
subject unto Him.

In this creed the preaching to the spirits is a preaching by the Risen Christ at the time of His ascension, addressed to departed souls which have been stopped in the course of their ascent to heaven and held captive by hostile spiritual powers (a Gnostic conception); but it has been misinterpreted by the author of the Epistle as a reference to a descent of Christ into Hades. But, in view of the large number of alterations of the text which are involved (the bringing of 1^{20} into connexion with $3^{18ff.}$, the alteration of the order of words and the omission of several words in *v.* 18, the omission of πορευθείς in *v.* 19, the omission of ὅς, the substitution of ἐκάθισεν for ἐστιν, and the transposition of the first two clauses in *v.* 22) and of the fact that the rhythmical form noticeable in *vv.* 18 and 22 is not discernible in *v.* 19, Bultmann's reconstruction seems extremely improbable. The conclusion of Jeremias,[6] that the most that can be said with any certainty is that in *vv.* 18 and 22 'older christological formulae are used' and that we cannot even be sure that *vv.* 18 and 22 formed originally a continuous text, would seem to be justified. We shall, therefore, not attempt to explain *v.* 19 as originally independent of *v.* 20, but shall consider it in the light of its immediate sequel.

In the exegesis of 3^{19} there are three main questions to be answered.

1. *Who are meant by 'the spirits in prison'?* Calvin[7] understood the souls of the faithful of Old Testament times to be meant. He explained φυλακή here as signifying not a prison but a watch-tower or else the act of watching ('the meaning would be very appropriate, that godly souls were watching in hope of the salvation promised them, as though they saw it afar off'), though he allowed the meaning 'prison' as a possible but less likely alternative ('as, while they lived, the Law, according to Paul [Gal 3^{23}], was a sort of prison in which they were kept, so after death they must have felt

[1] See further (in addition to the commentaries on 1 Peter): W. Bieder, *Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi* [Zürich, 1949]; R. Bultmann, 'Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief' in *Coniectanes Neotestamentica*, xi. [Lund, 1947]; F. L. Cross, *I Peter: A Paschal Liturgy* [1954]; O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, Eng. tr. [1949], 18–21; G. Friedrich in *TWNT*, iii. 705 f. (in article on κηρύσσω); J. Jeremias, 'Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern' in *ZNW*, xlii. [1949] 194–201, and in *TWNT*, i. 149 f. (in article on ᾅδης), and v. 769 f. (in article on παράδεισος); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* [1950], 378–383; B. Reicke, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism* [Lund, 1946]; E. Schweizer, '1 Petrus 4. 6' in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, viii. [1952], 152–154, and in *TWNT*, vi. 414, 446 (in article on πνεῦμα); E. Stauffer, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* [Stuttgart, 4th ed. 1948], 113–115. There is also a brief but suggestive reference in K. Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, II. ii. 561.

[2] *Die Katholischen Briefe* [3rd ed. rev. H. Preisker, Tübingen, 1951], 70, 73—though see p. 71, lines 7 ff., which perhaps implies that not all these verses belong to the hymn.

[3] See Note 1. [4] See Note 1. [5] See Note 1.

[6] In *ZNW* article: See Note 1.

[7] *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles* [Eng. tr. by J. Owen, reprinted Grand Rapids, U.S.A., 1948], 112–116.

the same desire for Christ'). But Calvin's interpretation breaks down on *v.* 20; for his attempt to avoid taking ἀπειθήσασιν to refer to the spirits of the previous verse is unconvincing.

Since the publication of F. Spitta's *Christi Predigt an die Geister* [Göttingen, 1890], many scholars (*e.g.*, R. Reitzenstein,[1] F. Hauck,[2] E. G. Selwyn,[3] B. Reicke,[4] J. Jeremias [5]) have accepted the identification of the spirits with the fallen angels of Gn 6. In favour of this interpretation it is pointed out that πνεῦμα is occasionally used absolutely of supernatural beings elsewhere in the New Testament (*e.g.*, Lk 10^{20}, Heb 1^{14}) as well as in the LXX (*e.g.*, 1 K 22^{21}) and the Pseudepigrapha; that a tradition based on Gn 6 of an angelic disobedience was firmly established in Jewish thought (*e.g.*, I Enoch 6 and 12–16, II Baruch 56^{12}); that this angelic disobedience was thought of as having occurred in the period immediately before the Flood; that according to Jewish tradition it was punished by imprisonment (*e.g.*, I Enoch $10^{11ff.}$ $18^{13ff.}$); and that there are clear allusions to this tradition in the New Testament in 2 P 2^4 and Jude 6. According to Jeremias Christ's going and preaching (the possibility of deliverance) to the spirits in prison is intentionally contrasted with Enoch's going and proclaiming to them that their plea for forgiveness will never be granted.

Others (*e.g.*, G. Friedrich,[6] E. Stauffer,[7] F. W. Beare,[8] E. Schweizer [9]) favour the older interpretation according to which the spirits referred to in *v.* 19 are the souls of those who perished in the Flood. The supporters of this view naturally appeal to *v.* 20 and to 4^6. There are others who, feeling the strength of the arguments on both sides, seek to combine both interpretations. So Windisch, while maintaining that the spirits in *v.* 19 must be the fallen angels of Gn 6, thinks that in *v.* 20 the generation of Noah's contemporaries is referred to, and so suggests that the author has both groups in mind (cf. J. W. C. Wand [10]: E. G. Selwyn, mentioned above as supporting the fallen angels interpretation, admits that this explanation is possible). But in view of 3^{20} and 4^6 the most probable interpretation is surely that which identifies the spirits in prison with the souls of the men who perished in the Flood. That πνεῦμα could be used to denote the soul of a dead person is clear from such examples as Heb 12^{23} (πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων) and Song of the Three Holy Children, 63 (εὐλογεῖτε, πνεύματα καὶ ψυχαὶ δικαίων, τὸν κύριον)—though it is true that no exact parallel has so far been adduced for πνεῦμα used absolutely in this sense.

2. *When did this preaching of Christ to the spirits take place?* The suggestion (Augustine, Spitta, etc.) that it took place in the time of Noah and that the reference is to a preaching by the pre-existent Christ through the lips of Noah to those who at the time the Epistle was written were in prison in Hades, but at the time of the preaching were still alive, is far-fetched. That it took place after the Resurrection also seems, on the whole, unlikely, though this suggestion cannot be ruled out altogether (Calvin, who takes ᾧ to refer to πνεύματι, thinks of a going and preaching by the Risen Christ through the Holy Spirit—and so not directly.[11]). The most probable answer seems to be that this preaching took place in the interval between Christ's death and resurrection.[12] If we understand ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι as indicating Christ's state during the period between Good Friday afternoon and Easter morning, when His spirit was alive but His body had not been raised, we may either explain ᾧ as referring to πνεύματι (the meaning of ἐν ᾧ [13] being that it was 'in spirit,' *i.e.*, as a bodiless spirit, that He went and preached to the spirits of the dead) or explain ἐν ᾧ as temporal (the meaning being that it was during this time, *i.e.*, the time indicated by θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι, that Christ went and preached). But it is perhaps rather more likely, in view of the use of ζωοποιέω elsewhere in the New Testament (cf. Jn 5^{21}, Ro 4^{17} 8^{11}, 1 Co $15^{22.\ 36.\ 45}$), that ζωοποιηθεὶς refers to the resurrection of Christ. (For πνεύματι in this connexion, cf. Ro $1^{3f.}$ and 1 Ti 3^{16}. It cannot be an instrumental dative, as we might at first be inclined to think; for the parallelism requires that it should have the same sort of meaning as σαρκί. It may perhaps be translated 'in the sphere of the Spirit [or, of spirit]' or 'in the spiritual sphere'.) If the reference of ζωοποιηθείς to the Resurrection is accepted, the preaching may still be understood to

[1] *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse* [1919], 25 ff., and *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* [1921], 111 ff.

[2] *Die Kirchenbriefe* [Göttingen, 5th ed., 1949].

[3] *The First Epistle of St. Peter* [1946].

[4] See Note 1, p. 369.

[5] In *ZNW* article: See Note 1, p. 369.

[6] See Note 1, p. 369.

[7] See Note 1, p. 369.

[8] *The First Epistle of Peter* [1947].

[9] In *TWNT* article: see Note 1, p. 369.

[10] *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* [1934].

[11] *Op. cit.*, 113.

[12] Lk 23^{43} ('To day shalt thou be with me in paradise') might seem to present a difficulty. But the descent into Hades and the fulfilment of the promise to the thief are surely not necessarily mutually exclusive. For a different explanation see Jeremias' *ZNW* article cited in Note 1, p. 369.

[13] The ingenious conjectural emendation by J. Rendel Harris, which makes Enoch the subject of ἐκήρυξεν, though accepted by Moffatt, may safely be rejected.

have taken place during the interval between Good Friday afternoon and Easter morning, if we take ἐν ᾧ in a temporal sense. It is possible that the writer added the words θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι parenthetically on mentioning the death of Christ and intended ἐν ᾧ to refer back to the time indicated by καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ, or else that he intended ἐν ᾧ to refer to the whole of *v.* 18, since in a general way the time indicated by the whole verse (including the reference to the Resurrection) might be said to be the time of an event which took place between Christ's death and resurrection.

3. *What was the content of this preaching?* It has been suggested by Selwyn that ἐκήρυξεν means not that Christ preached the gospel to the spirits in prison but that He made proclamation to them of the approaching end of their power as a result of His victory. He compares the use of κηρύσσω in Rev 5^2, where the content of the κηρύσσειν is not the gospel but the challenge, 'Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?' But it is much more likely that κηρύσσω has here its normal New Testament sense of preaching the gospel. That it does is confirmed by εὐηγγελίσθη in 4^6, if (as seems almost certain) that verse refers back to the preaching mentioned in 3^{19}. Whereas Enoch's message to the fallen angels in answer to their plea for forgiveness was the stark announcement of their irrevocable doom, 'You have no peace' (I Enoch 16^4), Christ's message to the spirits in prison was the good news of the possibility of deliverance (cf. 4^6: ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι).

II

We turn now to the exegesis of 4^6. In the previous verse the writer has pointed out that those pagans who resent the changed manner of life of their former companions, now Christians, will have to answer before God who is ready to judge both the living and the dead. This mention of the dead (νεκρούς) apparently suggests to him another thought, to which he gives expression in this verse.

The suggestion that the νεκροί of *v.* 6 are the spiritually dead [1] is unlikely in view of the use of the word in *v.* 5. Hardly more probable is the view that by νεκροῖς are meant those Christians who, having heard the gospel (εὐηγγελίσθη) during their lifetime, have subsequently died.[2] By far the most likely explanation is that there is a reference back to 3^{19}, and that the νεκροί of 4^6 are to be identified with the πνεύματα of 3^{19} (or perhaps we should say 'include' rather than 'are to be identified with': 4^6 may represent a generalizing of the statement in 3^{19}) and that εὐηγγελίσθη refers to the preaching by Christ which is spoken of in 3^{19}.[3]

As to the latter half of the verse, the best explanation is that, although κριθῶσι κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί and ζῶσι κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι are grammatically co-ordinate, in thought the former is subordinate to the latter and is equivalent to a concessive clause [4]—'in order that, although in the eyes of men they have been judged in the flesh, they might nevertheless live in God's sight in the spirit.' (It is interesting to compare Wis $3^{2.4}$.) This involves taking κριθῶσι to refer to an action which had already taken place before the action of the main verb εὐηγγελίσθη (the reference in κριθῶσι being to their death): this is certainly difficult, but probably not impossible.[5]

III

That the doctrine of these verses is extremely perplexing cannot be denied. Here indeed, to use Bengel's apt phrase, is a *locus mysterii plenus*.[6] The idea 'that Christ's soul went' and preached to the dead obviously struck Calvin as fanciful, while the further idea that men who during their lifetime had never come to faith in Christ (not even the faith which the men of the Old Testament can be said to have had) could after their death be saved seemed to him to need 'no long refutation; for it is an indubitable doctrine of Scripture, that we obtain not salvation in Christ except by faith; then there is no hope left for those who continue to death unbelieving.'[7] So he was at pains to find another interpretation, as we have already seen; and in the *Institutes*, II. xvi. 8–12, he explains the clause of the Creed, 'He descended into hell,' by reference to the Cry of Dereliction on the Cross. But—though for any one who knows how humble, sober and penetrating an exegete Calvin is, it is always a serious matter to disagree with him—we cannot follow Calvin in his interpretation of 1 P 3^{19} and 4^6.

If then, unlike Calvin, we admit that these verses refer to a preaching by Christ to the souls of unbelievers during the interval between His death and His resurrection, what are we to make of this doctrine? We shall be wise, I think, to

[1] So Clement of Alexandria; recently Bieder (see Note 1, p. 369).

[2] So Selwyn.

[3] So Beare, Schweizer, etc.

[4] Cf. Calvin, *op. cit.*, 126.

[5] For the ingenious, but to the present writer unconvincing, suggestion that ἵνα in this verse has a causal sense with κριθῶσι and a final sense with ζῶσι, see Schweizer, *Theologische Zeitschrift* article (see Note 1 p. 369).

[6] *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, on 1 P 3^{19}.

[7] *Op. cit.*, 113.

hesitate before brushing it aside as a 'fantastic dream,' as Beare does.[1] For one thing, the idea of a descent of Christ into Hades is not limited in the New Testament to these two verses: it occurs also in Ac $2^{27.\ 31}$, Ro 10^{6-8}, Eph 4^{8-10} (cf. Mt 12^{40}). For another thing, the restraint and sobriety of 1 P 3^{19} 4^{6} contrast significantly with the exuberance of the legends concerned with this theme. Moreover, it is quite unnecessary to see here (with Windisch, Beare, *et al*) the influence of ancient pagan *Erlösermythologie* (*e.g.*, Beare, *op. cit.*, 145: 'It is nothing else than the appropriation, and the application to Christ, of a fragment of the redemption-mythology of the Oriental religions, best known to us in the ancient story of the Descent of Ishtar to the underworld, and reflected also in a number of Greek myths [Orpheus and Eurydice, Heracles and Alcestis, the story of Persephone, etc.]; it is rooted in old vegetation- and sun-myths'); for, given the fact of the interval between the death and the resurrection of Jesus, it was altogether natural for the earliest Christians, sharing contemporary Jewish ideas about the interim-state, to infer that the spirit of Jesus must have sojourned in Hades—an inference which Ps 16^{8-11} (cf. Ac $2^{25-28.\ 31}$ 13^{35}) was close at hand to encourage. Natural too for those who had come to know the grace and power of Christ was the further inference that even during this sojourn among the dead He must have been active to save. And the question whether there was hope for those who had died in unbelief was for many early Christians a poignant one, since it concerned their own parents and kinsfolk.[2]

Whether during the days between His resurrection and ascension Jesus ever gave His disciples any hint of what is asserted in these two verses we do not know. We cannot altogether rule out the possibility that He did. But, quite apart from such a possibility, what these verses say is, as an inference drawn by the faith of the Early Church [3] and finding a place within the New Testament witness to Christ, not without authority for us. It is a hint within the Canon of Scripture, puzzling indeed and obscure yet at the same time reassuringly restrained, that the mysterious interval between Good Friday afternoon and Easter morning was not empty of significance, but that in it too Jesus Christ was active as the Saviour of the world. It is a hint that the atoning efficacy of His death was available to those who had died in paganism in the generations before Christ. The generation of mankind which perished in the Flood is mentioned, not, we may assume, as being the sole recipients of this mysterious ministry, but because they were generally regarded as the most abandoned of sinners: if those whom Jewish opinion excluded altogether from hope (cf. Sanh. 10^{3}: 'The generation of the Flood hath no share in the world to come, nor shall they stand in the judgment . . .'[4]) were not beyond the reach of Christ's saving work, then none could be. It is a hint, too, surely, that those who in subsequent ages have died without ever having had a real chance to believe in Christ are not outside the scope of His mercy and will not perish eternally without being given in some way that is beyond our knowledge an opportunity to hear the gospel and accept Him as their Saviour.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 145.
[2] Cf. Hauck, *op. cit.*, 70.
[3] Of the first generation of the Early Church—if the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter is accepted.
[4] H. Danby, *The Mishnah* [1933], 397.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Breakwater that Disappeared

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Then cometh the evil one, and snatcheth away that which hath been sown in his heart.'—Mt 13^{19} (R.V.).

The New Testament scholars are never quite sure about this bit. They say that, so far as they can tell, Jesus usually told His parables without explaining them, and left us to work out their meaning. That is why a parable will bring one truth to us when we are seven and another when we are seventy. But two of the parables have explanations given to them—the parable of the sower, and the parable of the weeds which were sown in the farmer's good corn. Perhaps they were early sermons from one of the Christian preachers. Who knows? The explanations certainly do not seem so vivid as our Lord's stories.

But, wherever our text comes from, there can be no doubt about the truth it conveys. Some boys come to school with very fine records. And for a while we are inclined to think that they have earned them. But sometimes (not very often, thank goodness) they fail to live up to the promise they show in their first term or two. We hear about an occasional outburst of bad temper, an isolated example of selfishness, a cuss-word or two.

And I have known boys who, for more years than they could remember, have always ended

each day with a prayer and a few minutes with their Bible. But there comes a night when they are so dog-tired that they excuse themselves with a facile 'It can't do much good to say prayers when I'm flat out.' Before long I have heard in the corridor whispers that so-and-so has given up believing in God!

The foundations have cracked. I wonder whether you will believe me when I tell you that very often I have heard, not so long afterwards, a conversation between my colleagues in the Common Room which has included the ominous sentence, 'So-and-so has gone to pieces?'

Once a famous architect went to Port Erin in the Isle of Man. He believed he could turn it into a prosperous place where deep water vessels could put in. The men who had lived there all their lives asked how he would do it. 'I shall build a breakwater out from the little bay. I shall make it of hundreds of concrete blocks, twenty and forty tons apiece, set like huge bricks.'

'But what will you set your concrete blocks on?' the natives asked. He told them that he would arrange for a foundation of hundreds of tons of shingle. 'It will never work,' the natives declared knowingly.

Soon, a tiny wisp of seaweed fastened on each of the myriad pebbles which made the foundation. Once fastened, it began to grow; and soon the tiny pieces of shingle one by one floated away. Eventually, their foundation gone, the huge concrete blocks tottered and fell at drunken angles. That is how I saw them some few years ago, scattered all over the bay like so many huge dice thrown out from the gaming-pot of the gods. That, anyway, is one parable that needs no explanation!

The seaweed was alive; and we have all noticed that the Bible often speaks of evil as a living force; our text said it was 'the evil one' which snatched away the seed sown in the heart. I don't know whether that means that there is one great power of evil whom we may call the devil; but it is quite plain that evil is alive, and able to grow within us. So foundations are not the only things that matter in life.

Sir Francis Drake of Cadiz fame knew this. This is what he said: 'There must be a begynning of any great matter, but the continewing unto the end until it be thoroughly finished yeldes the true glory.'

The Harvest Bell

By Rita Snowden, Auckland, New Zealand

Long ago, in Gross-la-witz, a little place in northern Germany, the people made plans to get a new bell for their church. They were simple people and poor; but there was no doubt that they needed a new bell. Every Sunday some of them came late for church, and some didn't come at all. Even when the weather was calm, sunny and still, the sound of the bell in their church tower was so soft that they couldn't hear it at a distance, and the old, who were a little deaf, couldn't hear it at all. And since nobody had clocks or watches, it put them into a fix.

'What we need,' said one of them, 'is a new bell.' 'Yes,' they all agreed, 'what we need is a new bell. But how can we pay for it? A bell with a loud, pleasant voice that would bring us all to church would cost a great deal.'

For a long time no one could think how they could pay for the new bell. Then something unexpected happened. Sunday by Sunday, on his way to church, the schoolmaster had to pass by an old wall. It had stood for so long that the winds had blown dust into its crevasses; and the sun and the rain had beat upon it. It was a lovely old wall, and the schoolmaster took very special notice of it.

For there, one morning, he found growing in a deep crevasse, blessed by the sun and the rain, a strong stalk of corn. His very first thought was that a bird had dropped the seed there; but his next thought was of the church bell.

Week by week, as he went by, changes were noticeable. At first it was a strong, green stalk. By and by, it began to fill out; and, at last, it ripened into a lovely golden colour. All the time the schoolmaster watched it carefully.

And when it was time to harvest it, he gathered it and took it home. He shook out the golden seed, and he laid it away in a safe, dry place.

When the time for planting came, he took it out and carefully planted it in his tiny garden. In time it came up; in time it grew golden, and he was able to gather it again. This time he had a lot more. And he planted it again. Soon he had to call in his neighbours to help, for his own tiny garden wasn't big enough. And year by year, together, they planted and gathered—for eight years! At the end of that time they had a large harvest, and together they were able to sell it.

With the money they got for it they bought, with happy hearts—what do you think? Yes, a bell for their church—a bell with a strong, pleasant voice that could be heard anywhere.

On the bell itself, before it was hung in the little church tower, they had engraved a six-eared stalk of corn—and the date, October the 15th, 1729.

Ever since, Sunday by Sunday, and especially year by year at harvest, the people of Gross-la-witz ring their bell joyously, and gather to thank God, who out of His great loving care gives us the harvest.

The Christian Year

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Empty House

BY THE REVEREND W. B. J. MARTIN, AUGUSTINE-BRISTO CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, EDINBURGH

'When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of that man is worse than the first.'—Mt 12^{43-45}.

'The last state of that man is worse than the first,' said Jesus. That is the 'punch-line' of the story, and it is in the light of that line that the parable is to be interpreted. It concerns the fact that there are some kinds of reform, revival, revolution, spring-cleaning, which actually do more harm than good. For a time they seem to produce results, but, either because they are not carried through to their full conclusion or because they are wrong from the start, they open the way for greater evils than those they displaced. But this parable is not simply a moral tale with a generalized meaning; it sprang out of a concrete situation and was told in order to illumine that situation. So we shall only appropriate the depth of this story for contemporary life if we see it first in the historic setting which produced it.

Matthew and Luke agree that the parable was told in answer to an attempt by the scribes and Pharisees to discredit the healing ministry of Jesus. They had just witnessed His success in dealing with a man who was blind and dumb, one who, in their own terms, was 'possessed with a devil.' They could not deny the evidence of their own eyes that the patient had recovered his sight and speech, so they alleged that Jesus possessed this power to cast out devils because He was in league with Beelzebub the prince of devils. Jesus, of course, had no difficulty in showing up the logical absurdity of this. 'If Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself.' He then pressed His case further home by asking, 'If I, by Beelzebub, cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?' The work of healing and exorcism was part of the normal work of the Jewish Church. Were its leaders prepared to accuse their co-religionists, who engaged in such work, of being hand-in-glove with the devil?

But Jesus was not content to leave the matter there. He freely conceded that many others beside Himself could 'spring-clean' human lives. He reminded the Pharisees that their own 'sons' had done so in the name of the God of Israel. They had recently seen John the Baptist do it, on a nation-wide scale, in the name of the Coming One. Perhaps it was the sight of Israel swept and garnished by that great cleansing movement of John, that gave special urgency to His words. Thousands of people had gathered on Jordan's banks and had accepted John's condemnation of their casual careless lives, and had plunged into the waters of repentance. This situation was full of promise and of peril. All would depend on what happened to these newly-cleansed lives. Would they be claimed for the Kingdom of God, or left to their own devices, or exploited in the interests of a power-hungry institution? The Pharisees could justly claim to be zealous evangelists, but, declared Jesus, they were doing more harm than good. 'Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.' These are strong words, but now in this parable He pronounces them with even greater emphasis. Not two-fold, but eight-fold, is the harm they do by their motives and methods of winning men for religion!

Such violent language must be taken seriously. The matter is one which evidently moved Jesus to the depths of His being. While He saw all around Him men and women who had undoubtedly been cleansed by the austere preaching of John the Baptist, He seems also to have seen the seven devils of pride, self-righteousness, intolerance, cruelty, envy, safety-first, world-rejection, spiritual-individualism, waiting in the shadows ready to move in to the empty house. And these, indeed, were the very sins which later resulted in His own rejection, His own trial, and scourging and crucifixion. The parable, then, points the contrast between the Pharisees' handling of men and His own, between their incomplete conception of the saved life and His.

1. The trouble with the Pharisees was their relatively superficial view of human nature. 'Jesus knew what was in man,' and He knew that this included both good and bad. But the 'bad' is not detachable, as though it were one unit among many others. It is inextricably interwoven into the total personality. Often, indeed, it was what men call 'evil' that gives the personality its drive and colour. We recall the entry in Martin Luther's *Table Talk*: 'I never work better than when I am inspired by anger; when I am angry, I can write, pray, and preach well, for then my whole temperament is quickened, my understanding sharpened, and all mundane vexations and temptations depart.' The habit of treating men's sins in isolation, of 'casting out the devil,' often results, as we have all observed, in a diminution of personality; a 'devil of a fellow' becomes an insipid, milk-and-watery, so-called Christian. As William Blake

saw, ' without contraries, there is no progression ' ; and Freud, from a different angle, has pointed out that the tensions of Eros are the creative moulders of man. But there are some schools of Christian thinkers who would simply make a clean sweep of the dangerous elements in man's make-up ; being frightened of the danger of man's lapse into animalism, they become the victims of ' angelism,' envisaging man as if he were pure spirit. They literally do not know what to do with man's physical life, his sexuality, his corporeal experience. But the Lord Christ had a deeper understanding of man's nature than this ; it was the whole man that had to be saved, and the ' bad ' as well as the ' good ' acknowledged and dealt with.

2. This deeper insight into man's real nature, gave Jesus also a deeper conception of conversion than that entertained by the Pharisees. In a famous sentence, still imperfectly grasped, He declared that He had come ' not to destroy but to fulfil.' He puts this in another way on this occasion by saying ' If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you.' Empty, swept and garnished lives can undoubtedly be produced by other ' fingers '—the finger of fear, pointing to the threat of ultimate destruction and offering safety here and hereafter ; the finger of self-interest, appealing to ' peace of mind ' or the comfortable adjustment to life. Such reformations are apt to be purely individualistic, they do not result in the Kingdom of God coming among men, they actually isolate men from one another in pride and superiority. And being individualistic, they result in strain and apprehension. The case-books of psychiatrists supply abundant evidence for the chaos introduced into lives that have been bullied by a sense of duty into acts of self-sacrifice for parents or friends, or frightened into submission to high ethical ideals. In contrast to this, the preaching of Jesus pointed men to a realm of power and love and peace, waiting to be appropriated. Jesus certainly called upon men to repent, but the repentance He envisaged was a more realistic attitude to life. Men are self-deceived when they see themselves as independent and unrelated, self-sufficient units, and this unreality puts them beyond the reach of God's fullest action. The more realistic we are about our dependence upon one another and the more fully we accept our place within the human family, the more open we become to the presence and power of God. This is why so much of the teaching of Jesus is concerned, not in the first place with God at all, but with exposing breakdowns in personal relationships and with arousing men to conviction of sin about the feebleness and unsatisfactoriness of their community living. Remember that the cry for faith was wrung from the heart of Peter when he was challenged by Jesus to forgive men until seventy times seven ! A man who has not attempted to live in fellowship with others, with all sorts of conditions of men, not merely with a specially selected, hand-picked group, but with the miscellaneous collection of people into whose company the grace of God has thrown him (the Church ?), will never know the demands that are made upon his life for integrity, honesty, love, forgiveness, for resources that are far beyond his own contriving.

3. The parable also points to the more profound conception of Jesus regarding the ' saved ' life. Emmanuel Mounier recalls seeing a poster somewhere in France during a general election which shocked him to the core. It read : ' Vote Catholic and Play Safe.' Where safety is made the end of the cleansed life, the way is open for ' seven other spirits more wicked ' than that which has been displaced. Man is made for God—not for safety. Norman Pittenger has pointed out how faulty is the familiar English translation of St. Augustine's famous phrase, ' Thou hast made us for Thyself, O God, and our heart is restless until it rests in Thee.' What Augustine wrote was ' *Tu fecisti nos ad te,*' and the force of the preposition ' *ad* ' indicates movement—to move towards Thee, a dynamic conception. It is for lack of this dynamic conception in the Christian life that so many converts lapse into chaos, and why so much social reform opens the way to boredom and frustration. It is strictly true that ' where there is no vision the people perish,' and perish even in the presence of security and welfare. As Carl Jung has pointed out, underlining the message of this parable, ' The hope of increasing the control of the destructive forces within man (and society) lies in enlarging man's image of self, of his individuality and his feelings of inner freedom and inner confidence.' The only productive conversion is conversion that introduces man to the Kingdom of God.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

A Comparison and a Contrast

An Address for Holy Communion

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, D.D., GLASGOW

' As many as came to the place where Asahel fell down and died stood still.'—2 S 2^{23}.

' Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.'—Rev 5^{12}.

When the writer of Hebrews says ' the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel,' he is finding suggestive points of similarity

or contrast in an Old Testament story as he thinks about the death of Christ. We may turn in the way he did to another place in the ancient Scriptures, that which records the death of Asahel.

As an episode in the tangle of intrigue and fighting going on between the supporters of David and those of the rival house of Saul the story seems of no great importance. After a certain successful skirmish a young man, Asahel, uses his speed to run down Abner, the stalwart captain of the defeated band. Abner sees that he is being overtaken, and he knows that if it comes to single combat he is far more than a match for this daring youth. He does not wish to have to kill him. Twice over he shouts back to him the advice to chase some one else if he is bent on making a captive. But, flushed with triumph, the young man will not take the warning and rushes on, and falls at Abner's deadly thrust. Then, as those following came to the place where his body lay, all stopped to gaze, their ardour suddenly quenched.

It was just one incident in a minor battle, but the narrative becomes touched with poetry and pathos and awe.

> The hot chase up the rocky slope is checked.
> The clambering figures freeze, and stand erect,
> Then in a widening ring close in, and stare.
> Each soldier has his life to sell
> And there are some that we could spare.
> But this, ah, this is Asahel.
> Fleet as a roe
> He chased the foe.
> Marked for his prize
> One twice his size.
> Deliberate, battle-wise.
> Who, panting, took the time to say
> In pity, 'Nay, lad, turn away.
> Safer to choose an easier prey.'
> But fear nor ruth
> Could halt impetuous youth.
> With his last breath
> He raced on death.
> Triumph, ye friends of David! Count the slain.
> Without some loss there never can be gain.
> But what the counter-weight in any scale
> For Asahel?

Such things happen in any campaign. After the last World War one little book told the story of the son of a famous writer, brought up in a home at Oxford where poets and scholars were his father's familiar guests, a brilliant student with an amazing power of mastering the languages of Eastern Europe, himself a poet and an eager politician. Joining up, and rising rapidly in Army Intelligence, he became involved in the intricate struggles in the Balkans. After a few months of heroic adventure and squalid hardship among Bulgarian resisters, whose love and devotion he quickly won, he was caught and shot as a guerilla. Another book told of a gigantic gentle young philosopher, shot in the same fashion by the Japanese in Burma, where he had been organizing revolt far behind their front line. His last request was that he alone might die and those under his orders be excused.

Over such incidents men brood and sorrow and think of what might have been; and thousands of names are unrecorded. The Hebrew chronicler notes the losses in that battle and names one, 'there lacked of David's servants nineteen men and Asahel.' And Asahel. For how many still on our Remembrance Days the recollection of the tragedy of war brings the sob and sigh, 'all these, and our Alec, our John.'

One may think about the pathos of earthly history, the waste and disappointment in it, and make a list of those cut off in early prime like Alexander and Cæsar and Keats and Schubert and Rupert Brooke, and all the gallant lads who fell in cruel war. Might one add to the roll the name of Jesus here? Is His death another tragic fact in history, to make men look in shocked bewilderment like those who stood still and gazed at Asahel.

The truth is that it is not enough, that it is even wrong, so to regard the death of Jesus, adding it to the list of the mysterious calamities of fate. The chief thing about the Cross is that it is not just a mystery, that it is a word, that it proclaims a glorious gospel and shows Divine love in operation, triumphing over sin and death. It is not merely a human event. It is the passion of God's love to save sinners at any price. When Christians think of Jesus' death, it is not with puzzled pity but with adoration and gratitude.

> In the Cross of Christ I glory,
> Towering o'er the wrecks of Time.

Though the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper contains a tragic memory and brings home to each man the shame of his own sin, it is not to be celebrated sadly. For the emphasis is on the presence of the Risen Lord who calls us as His guests into His fellowship. We do not sit in the sorrowful mood in which men recollect the sacrifice of one who is now absent. R. L. Stevenson was buried on a hill-top in Samoa, and on his tomb are graven his own lines

> Glad did I live and gladly die,
> And I laid me down with a will.

Recalling this, G. K. Chesterton said of him, 'His graveyard is a mountain peak, his epitaph a song.' Jesus has no grave, and the songs His followers sing are not about Him but to Him in worship—'Jesus, Thou Joy of loving hearts,' 'Jesus, Lover

of my soul.' How do we get to know any friend so intimately as by being guests at his table? When do we so truly know our Lord as when at His Table He reminds us of His self-sacrificing love?

It is often said that it is not good advice that is needed to set our life right but the welling up of love in our hearts and a renewal of hope and courage. This inspiration comes in fellowship with Jesus here. Not with tears do we gather round, but hailing Him with a shout of praise like the ten thousand times ten thousand before the heavenly throne. 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.'

But what the counter-weight in any scale—for Asahel? A bitter cynical answer is suggested in the sudden, dull, sad ending of Meredith's novel *Beauchamp's Career*. The brilliant hero is drowned in rescuing a little urchin from the muddy waters of the Thames. Beauchamp's two friends look at the boy, frightened, dripping and dirty but alive, and as their eyes meet they seem to say, 'This is what we have in exchange for Beauchamp.'

So what is the counter-weight for the sacrifice of Christ? The salvation of people like you and me! Was this worth it? No reasonable calculation can prove it. But the love of God makes no calculations. 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son'. At this we are lost in wonder, love and praise. But that is not all. We are, or we ought to be, lifted into that region of thought and conduct where love knows no arithmetic, and sacrifice has no limit, and men share the mind of Christ.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Is Your Child 'Called?'[1]

BY THE REVEREND DAVID FRANCIS, M.A., LONDON

'And Eli perceived that the Lord had called the child.'—1 S 3[8].

Here is a familiar and a favourite story. And in this story two things stand out, however we explain them. One is, that Samuel felt he was being *called*. The other is, that in this crisis Eli understood and helped in a vital way. These two certainties link up with the two things to be now emphasized.

1. One of these is that ultimately there comes a 'call' of this kind, from God, *to every one* of His children. That may be hard to accept. We are willing to concede that Jesus was called, and Paul too, and many an Old Testament prophet—like Samuel. But *all*? The child who wasn't intended or wanted? The child that starts life hopelessly handicapped? Surely not all?

Yes! Look at it this way. God's plan for every one of His children is fellowship with Himself. For this we were all made, that ultimately we might all come to know, love and live with our Father God. He makes it very clear that His plan is for *all* His children; and its very goodness depends on its being everybody's birthright. 'Either it is true for all or it is not true at all.'

And so, in His own time, God will try to establish contact with each and every child of His; He will work to communicate His plan, and to evoke an understanding of it—and a response. He will not attempt to approach every one in the same way; nor, usually, all at once. And about the ways of God in beckoning His children there is much that we may not yet understand.

Whether this call *is* indeed heard will depend on many things. But that God *will* ultimately beckon is as certain as, for example, puberty; it is part of His essential plan. Like the radio waves from the B.B.C., it is 'in the air,' and all around us, all the time. And every now and then one meets some one who has beyond question 'caught His wavelength' and is thrilled by this new awareness. But God's summoning voice is in the air for *all*. When will they tune in and hear? And what will be their response?

2. Their response will depend very much *upon us*; and this is the other thing to be stressed. Remember Eli, in our story. He was vitally needed that night. So often it is thus: that even God's great works depend for fulfilment on some human helper. Many, like the old invalid beside the Pool of Bethesda, may be very near to a source of new life. But at the vital moment, as he said, 'I have no one to help me.'

What will the children become? There may be undreamt-of possibilities in them; don't be too sceptical and unbelieving. I'm not sure which is the greater liability for a child: the blind adulation of the adoring kind of parent, or the scorn of the sceptical. Try to avoid both! And do be reverently aware of the infinite possibilities in your child not just of fame but of sheer *closeness-to-God*.

For the burning question is not really the 11-plus exam., the choice of career, the achieving of 'success'; but rather, will your children come to find and know, to love and to yield themselves gladly to their Father God? God has a plan for them, a rich destiny. But its fulfilment will depend quite a lot upon us. Eli helped in a vital way. *How can we help?*

We can help by our *desiring*—by our really wanting it to happen. Often we declare, ready for any sacrifice, 'I want the best for my child!' Do we, the *very* best? Some parents are indifferent to

[1] Sermon preached at a Parents' Service.

the spiritual fortunes of their child, some even antagonistic and obstructive when the soul is awakening; there is tragedy here, and the foreshadowing of a judgment, too. But there are other parents who see that nothing else matters so much as that ultimately their child should come to know God and be right with Him; and their longing is translated into prayer; not the possessive ambition which is set on 'my baby boy becoming a minister,' nor the self-evident 'piety' that embarrasses and repels, but a deep and humble caring. So Monica prayed for her erring son, who was to become St. Augustine; and Bishop Ambrose testified: 'It is impossible that the son of so many tears should be lost.'

We can help, too, by preparing the ground. A child is unlikely to hear God unless some sympathetic agencies have been at work to make him ready, spiritually awake and alert. Here baptism is a big factor, if approached in sincerity; with our prayers and those of the church mobilized together for the blessing of the child. So, too, the Sunday School can make a big difference, not just in teaching a child *about* God but in making him more ready *for* God. The Christian education our children receive at their day schools, also, if well done—and here, too, parents can have a decisive influence for good—will be another factor in preparing the soil for God's good seed to grow in. But, above all, we can be helping at home; by training our children humbly in prayer (a very different thing from just insisting that they 'say their prayers'), by answering their questions (as honestly and sympathetically as we can) and by going forward on this spiritual quest with them.

We can help also by being watchful for any signs of God's calling. It is for us to watch for evidences of inward awareness and of the silent beckonings of God. And when that crisis is upon us—it *is* a crisis, however quietly and naturally it comes—we can help so much: *not* by being intrusive and crude; *nor*, equally, by keeping away, indifferent, embarrassed or afraid; but by *standing by*, always caring and never coercing.

But we can help most of all *by making sure that we are as open to God as we want them to be.* All we have said is built up on the assumption that we are 'there,' where we wish our children to be. But can we assume this? And, if not, how far can we help them? We cannot enter into their feelings, when God seems to be calling them, unless we have previously entered into the same experience. And we have no right to point them to a path that we are not trying to tread ourselves.

The call is for all? That does not just mean your child; it means you, too. Have you responded? If not, then the same good God who is calling your child is calling you also. And it is never too late, and we are never too old, never too travel-stained, to be acceptable to Him if we will but answer. You will remember how Jesus Himself prayed, when He thought of that little 'family' that He had been nurturing for God: 'For their sake I consecrate myself.' Cannot you make that same prayer yours?

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Going Somewhere?

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR GEORGE JOHNSTON, B.D., PH.D., EMMANUEL COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, CANADA

'By faith Abraham obeyed when he was called to go out . . . and he went out, not knowing where he was to go.'—He 11^{8} (R.S.V.).

1. If one were to begin a talk on the American continent with the words, 'Now, take Abraham . . .,' many people would immediately think of the greatest President of the United States. But a Christian who talks about father Abraham has in mind, not Lincoln for all his virtues, but rather the son of Terah who left Ur of the Chaldees with his family for Haran, some four thousand years ago. Then, on one unforgettable day he announced to his friends and neighbours that he was off on pilgrimage again. 'Whither bound?' they crowded round to ask him; and the simple soul replied, 'I don't know.'

It is a breath-taking start to one of the most famous and most audacious adventures ever undertaken. Perhaps we feel that Abraham is pretty remote from life to-day. But have we any idea in this sputnik age whither Man himself is going at this moment? It is not good enough to say he is off to the moon or to Mars. What does it matter, after all, which planets men visit or where they live or what their nuclear power can do for them, if in fact they are all at sea in space and have no definite goals for the life of their spirits? In every major crisis of history mankind is a kind of Abraham, man the nomad who must strike out for the undiscovered lands.

The author of Hebrews saw in Abraham one of the heroes of faith, and from our text in the context of this wonderful eleventh chapter we may derive these lessons for the living of these days.

2. (1) *If you are going to get anywhere, you need convictions about the Invisible.* 'Faith is . . . the conviction of things not seen.' What a battle-cry for a world that is in danger of a stampede to replace humane culture with a nuclear technology! As if it were not the very best scientific minds that are insisting on man's dignity as a truly responsible creature, with illimitable power within his grasp! What will it profit Britain to reproduce the energy of the Sun in a Harwell laboratory, if that energy

bring no light, no hope, no comfort to the people? It is, indeed, a great wonder, before which the layman stands in awe, that men like ourselves have teased out the secrets of the atom and exploited the nucleus for their own purposes; nevertheless, He who made the nuclear forces is infinitely more wonderful. St. Paul in company with learned rabbis and most simple folk believed that God's existence follows inevitably from the givenness of the universe about us: He is its Origin, and for His will it exists. We men are His creatures, with an inborn organ of moral discrimination.

To become an Abraham or a Moses, says our author, you must persist in life 'as seeing him who is invisible.' Faith can do this because faith simply takes God on trust; and this is eminently reasonable. Faith is not merely an idea in the head; it is a commitment of one's whole being. And faith is no miserable shouting in the dark to drive away terror that affrights us; it is an encounter with Reality, the awareness of a Presence. Whenever the encounter takes place in mystical religion, said Rufus Jones, 'it seems possible to stand the universe —even to do something toward the transformation of it. And if the experience does not prove that the soul has found God, it at least does this: it makes the soul feel that proofs of God are wholly unnecessary.'

When they asked Abraham whither he was bound, he told them, 'Somewhere, I don't know where. All I know is that my God is with me, and I must go.' Abraham was not deceived, nor will we be deceived if we put our trust in God the Unseen and claim our faith as the very title-deeds of Heaven.

(2) *If you are going to get anywhere, you must submit to the Call of the Invisible.* What is faith? It is, as Lex Miller has written, 'three parts obedience.' We know that it is quite possible to hold correct views about God without having this commitment of service. The devils may believe, and tremble. Piety and good works need not cohabit with theology; convictions about the Invisible may spring from the strains of life and the sense of one's failures without any guarantee that the heart as well as the head has been seized. Jesus said once that His meat was to do the will of the Father, and His single-minded obedience lies at the root of His incarnate glory. Dedication is another name for obedience, and man must learn dedication if his vision is to bring him victory as artist, scientist, civilizer, or man of faith.

So Abraham heard the Call and immediately made preparations to abandon the now familiar places and the old friends and the older gods. He set the day, and promptly on the hour he left. It is not always like that when men and women have similar experiences, for men do not love the highest when they see it or hear its word. Faith is not fully itself until it has issued in obedience, even as love is but an empty sound if there be no real person to be loved and served.

(3) *If you are going to get anywhere, you must venture beyond your normal vision.* 'He went out, not knowing where he was to go.' At a later stage in the pilgrimage, as recounted in Gn 12^9, Abraham journeyed on, still going toward the Negeb; that is, he kept pressing on toward the Southland. On and on, beyond the sunset, not knowing what awaited him Abraham went forward, because God was with him. What a great discovery that was! He did not, and could not, travel beyond God's love and care, since God is not tied to Haran or to the desert. When our fathers went to Africa or India or the Americas, when they slipped beneath the girdle of the globe to antipodean waters, they did not find that God was a laggard stay-at-home, content with Plymouth Ho or Edinburgh Castle. Go with God, and you come to that place whither He would lead you.

3. Abraham went out, we are told, with the echo of a promise from God ringing in his ears: 'I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you . . . and by you all the families of the earth will bless themselves.' This conception of the Covenant answers to the most intimate religious experience of the Hebrews, and their Scripture which is ours also is the record of God's fidelity to His promise; at the same time it records how the people of Abraham failed God over and over again. Then, through the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ, who came to help the descendants of Abraham (He 2^{16}) and to fulfil the ancient Covenant (Gal $3^{16.\ 29}$), God enacted a new and better covenant. Every Christian is pledged to it, and each occasion of the Lord's Supper renews its promise. Even now we are to see in the Church catholic, missionary, and world-wide, the fulfilment of the word to Abraham.

It is man's destiny, we believe, to reach the haven of the Divine Kingdom of joy and blessedness; and upon it his sights should be set. Here at the cross-roads of history we must stand and proclaim to the nations that God is, that God goes ahead, that God is invincible Love. Here we must call men to the place where on their knees they may encounter the real Lord, with whom are the issues from death. For they must learn to see Him who is invisible and to heed His call whose plan must succeed. That plan is for every man, of whatever race and colour, by the obedience of true faith and the spirit of genuine love, to inherit Eternity and to enjoy the blessings of God's Kingdom for ever.

The Doctrine of the Trinity

Its Necessity and its Expression

By the Reverend E. L. Wenger, M.A., B.D., Serampore College, Serampore, India

Natural man appears to be monolatrous ; that is to say, though as polytheist he may admit the existence of many gods, and may indeed worship them in turn, yet in his instincts and in his heart he can worship only one god at a time. And, slightly stretching language, we may say that among ordinary Christians this monolatry becomes a unitarianism. The Christian admits in theory the three-fold revelation of God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but for the most part he can only grasp one aspect and in his heart's religion he is only unitarian. The Trinitarian doctrine is frequently only an intellectual puzzle, a problem for thought, a matter best left to the theological experts. This article seeks to show briefly how necessary this doctrine of the Trinity is for practical Christian living and to suggest a way of expressing it which will soften the difficulty for thought.

1. *Necessity in Practice.* The spiritual life must be founded firmly on Trinitarian doctrine, not merely in verbal creed, but in feeling and in life. This does not mean that every member of each congregation should grasp the doctrine, but every pastor should know the significance of the doctrine for the life of the Church, so as to be able in his teaching ministry to bring out now one aspect and now another, and, if in his pastoral ministry he finds emphases becoming one-sided, to be able to supply the necessary corrective and balance. There is a tendency in most people to think of God in only one way ; they try to force all their religious conceptions into a single mould. They tend to be unitarian, but there are different kinds of unitarianism.

(1) There are some who are conscious of God's greatness, of His power, of His aloofness. He is Almighty, everything happens by His will. He is ruler of the universe. Religion of this this-worldly kind may take a hard form or a soft form ; both of which are found amongst Christians, though the one is more akin to Islam and the other to one form of Hinduism. In the former case, religion consists of saying *namaz* (daily prayers) at the proper times, so that the feudal Lord will be satisfied with the dues paid to Him. He will not then interfere when the worshipper, in turn, exercises all his own skill and power for his own ends over others who are weaker or inferior to himself. Such a religion may give an inner strength born of self-confidence, but it makes a man self-centred and does not encourage social and ethical graces.

In the latter case, God is acknowledged as benevolent Father, and stress is laid on His kindness, though at times He may be a little unpredictable. It may be that Jesus is called God, but this acknowledgment of Him as Divine does not escape from unitarianism of a monarchian kind, for Jesus is only another name for Father. I found a vivid expression of this unitarianism when a village pastor in East Pakistan, who has not had any theological training and who himself was at the time a little emotionally and mentally unbalanced, asked me to go with him to pray for a paralytic. In fiercely emotional tones he got the man to pray with him again and again ejaculating, ' Jisu, baba', (Jesus, daddy !) In fact, this emphasis on Jesus as Divine is an emphasis on compassion and ignores His relationship to the Father. It gives a sentimental religion with a ' soft ' God and without the element of unconditional demand. It is not essentially different from the worship, found in Hinduism, of god as ' mother ' ; the person whose children expect to receive boundless affection and care, but they never give to her anything but lip-service. Is this why it seems so easy to incorporate Jesus, as seen in this partial way, into a syncretistic religion, and why a Trinitarian Christianity cannot be so incorporated ?

(2) Religion may take the form of a unitarianism of the ' second person ', and be an other-worldly religion. It may take an exclusively and emotional evangelical form, in which it is concerned only with salvation, and God is known only as Saviour. It may sound odd to call this unitarianism, and, of course, the persons concerned would not consciously or in expressed theological formulation admit that God the Father was displaced by Jesus the Saviour : but in practice it often is so. Natural duties get forgotten, even moral obligations are lost sight of, in an exalted experience of redemption from ' sin ' and hell by the blood of the Cross. This one-sidedness is partly by way of reaction from the religion which has been entirely unitarian of the benevolent Father type, and sometimes when it has spent itself it lapses back into that former unitarianism. I suspect, too, that the tendency to play down history in some forms of existentialism may lead to a unitarianism of the Saviour-God type.

Another unitarianism of the ' second person ' shows itself in the Hindu's response to the tragic figure of Love dying on the Cross. Here is worship of dying Love that evokes sympathy also for the

weak who suffer through no fault of their own, but if it is merely that, it lacks the ground-faith in the God above, who raises the dead.

(3) There are others for whom religion is entirely a matter of the Spirit within. Sometimes persons, passing on from the evangelical worship of Christ, seek the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and then, forgetting the ladder by which they climbed, they lose themselves in a false pentecostalism, which is equally one-sided. Religious exercise then becomes a frequent endeavour to recapture an experience of emotional exaltation or even of complete unconsciousness; it is a pursuit of 'gifts' of the Spirit, a seeking for additional abnormal powers for himself, and a disregard of the 'fruit' of the Spirit. 1 Corinthians 12^3 gives a glimpse of an extreme form in which persons, claiming to be under the 'Spirit', could actually say, 'Jesus is accursed'. Such an extreme form is not likely to be found in churches to-day, none the less the worship of Christ is sometimes neglected in the extravagant seeking of new proofs of the presence of the 'Spirit' within. Here, again, in time, when the emotional wave has spent itself, there may be a lapse back to the former unitarianism, until someone comes to whip up the emotions again.

On the other hand there are forms of religion which have a vague notion of the immanent Spirit. These, too, are unitarianisms of what we may call the 'third person'.

Against all such unitarianisms the positive Christian teaching is that God manifests Himself continuously in three ways:

(1) We feel a 'greatness' or a 'power' which is utterly beyond human conception, especially as we see the starry heavens above, or bow our heads in a storm or gaze out over the ocean. 'How great Thou art', is indeed a religious cry. But that power is not blind: it is not the power of a machine, it is not mere bigness. Along with it we feel that the power which finds expression in Nature is power under the control of One who is revealed through Jesus Christ as Love. At the same time this Love is Holy Love, with unconditional demand. The knowledge of God as Almighty Father is incomplete unless the nature of Almightiness is seen in the character and power of Jesus, and the meaning of Fatherhood is seen in the relation of Jesus to the Father as obedient and trusting Son. Further we also come to feel that this supernatural power is available, at least in some measure, to believers.

(2) Then, again, there is the experience of salvation: but it is a salvation not altogether out of the world, but a salvation to be found and lived out in the world; for the world is basically God's creation, however marred it may have become. Salvation is not a withdrawal from the world, but a restoration in and of the world.

Then, again, from another angle, we feel the wonder of 'love' of another personality: especially the love seen in the Person of Jesus Christ. Who is not overwhelmingly moved as he looks at the Cross of Jesus Christ, and feels that there is the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me? True: but that love is not an ineffective, tragic love: it is love that has power, that can move mountains, that raises the dead. Further, this love has authority: it is not to be trifled with, it must not be rejected. And yet again, this love is not to be merely admired or even only enjoyed for oneself: but it is to be expressed in us, and to be shown through us to others.

(3) Then, again, we feel a supernatural power within us, working in us a righteousness which seemed too hard for us, doing wonders in us that we never dreamed we were capable of: this is the Holy Spirit. True: but this Spirit is the Spirit of *God*, who demands our obedience. We are not the masters of this power or of this Spirit: we cannot be like the mythological Brahmans who by their *tapasa* (austerities) acquired such power that they were even stronger than the gods. This Spirit is master of us. It is not an instrument for us to use: rather we are the instruments of the Spirit for its expression. Again, this is the Spirit of Christ: its nature and character we know from Christ. It is not a vague influence into which different people can put such content as will satisfy their own wishes. In this way we distinguish the Holy Spirit from the other spirits: and the need is still as great to-day to learn to discern the spirits as it was when Paul in writing to the Church at Corinth listed discernment of spirits as one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit (1 Co 12^{10}).

Such, then, is the necessity for the doctrine of the Trinity for Christian living. By whatever way we know God, whether through Nature, through the Man Jesus, or through the Spirit within, this knowledge will be inadequate and misunderstood unless it is integrated with the knowledge that comes to us through the other forms of His self-revelation. George Matheson's magnificent hymn, after recounting the real but partial expressions of God's revelation seen in other religions, in the last verse shows the partial ways in which Christians themselves know God:

> Some seek a Father in the heavens above,
> Some ask a human image to adore,
> Some crave a spirit vast as life and love;
> Within Thy mansions we have all and more;
> Gather us in.

The fullness of God's revelation is in Him as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, one God.

2. *The Expression of the Doctrine.* That there is one God, but three Persons in the Trinity, causes perplexity for thought. The notion that Father,

Son and Spirit, three Persons, are one God has been reduced to absurdity by the formula 1+1+1 =not 3, but 1. Can this apparent *reductio ad absurdum* be avoided? I owe to Mr. Munshi of Faridpur, himself a convert from Islam, a clue. He once noted the very simple equation, to which no one can take exception, 1×1×1=1. Arithmetically this is unimpeachable: but does the multiplication formula have any spiritual significance? There is another way in which it may be taken to express a spiritual truth.

We may make use of the conception of three dimensions. A cube which is one foot long, one foot broad, and one foot high, is in volume, not three cubic feet, but one cubic foot. The unity of God is not a bare unity, a one-dimensional unity (if the analogical phrase may be allowed). But God as known by the Christian acts in three different ways, but even so the whole Godhead is always so acting, the whole Godhead is behind every act. We might say that when God acts on us in one 'dimension', the other 'dimensions' are also involved. Using quite ordinary symbolism we speak of height and length and breadth in regard to God: the height of God's transcendent greatness, the length to which His love goes in seeking the sinner, and the breadth which can embrace in one fellowship of the Spirit both Jew and Gentile, bond and free. The one God who is so utterly above us, is the same one God who comes all the way to meet us, to save us to the uttermost, is the same one God who embraces us all in the one fellowship. Thus Paul calls the Ephesians (3^{18}) 'to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height' (depth is the same dimension as height). If a mathematical symbol is to be used, the multiplication sign, expressive of volume, carrying the idea of 'filling' all things, is far more significant than any use of the addition sign. The one cube is seen from several sides, but each side is a face of the one whole cube. Is this Sabellian? No. It is rather the addition sign which suggests Sabellianism, as it is used, for instance, in the formula that has been offered: infinity plus infinity plus infinity equals infinity. The addition sign suggests a one-dimensional continuum, in which three separate entities are placed successively together, one succeeding another, and thus conveying doctrinally Sabellianism. The multiplication sign better expresses the thought that we worship one God, known as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

But the essential thing is to know the fact through experience, which is best summed up in the words 'through Christ we have access in one Spirit to the Father.'

Recent Foreign Theology

Missions in Theological Education. The second volume of Dr. O. G. Myklebust's great work on *The Study of Missions in Theological Education* (the first volume was reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvii. [July 1956] 318 f.) has now appeared.[1] Written in faultless English, it embodies a vast amount of research, and is packed with information about theological institutions in many countries, and it is to be as warmly commended as was the earlier volume. The present volume covers the period from 1910, *i.e.*, from the Edinburgh Missionary Conference, to 1950. The author notes with regret the lack of Chairs of Missions in English universities and colleges, but it is to be observed that he records that in Dutch universities the subject was taught by Professors of Biblical Theology and Christian Dogmatics, while in Montpellier it was treated as a part of Practical Theology. In many American seminaries it is linked with Comparative Religion as a single discipline. Most British universities would agree with the German Martin Schlunk, who is reported to have held that Comparative Religion should be treated as a separate subject, and not as a part of the science of missions (p. 108), while Practical Theology is left to the denominational colleges, and is not regarded as an academic subject. It is doubtful, however, if the place of missions in the thought and life of a theological student can be measured by the academic courses he pursues, and the reviewer can testify that his own study of missions was nourished by the whole atmosphere of the College where he was trained and by the extra-curricular literature which he read. To say this is not to detract from this most valuable and objective study of the place missions have had in the curricula of universities and seminaries during the past half century.

[1] *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, ii. [1957]. Forlaget Land og Kirke, Oslo; Fr. 29·50.

China and Christianity. A Chinese Roman Catholic priest, Fr. F. Houang, now an exile in Europe, has published, in a single volume, entitled *The Chinese Spirit and Christianity*,[2] some lectures delivered separately in different places. The first

[2] *Âme chinoise et Christianisme* [1957]. Casterman, Paris; Fr. 570.

lecture is a brief survey of the spiritual history of China, from primitive animism through Confucianism and Buddhism to the characteristically Chinese outlook, which can combine all and which is marked by various qualities, of which one of the most important is tolerance. There is a brief, but useful, appendix on Islam in China. The author rightly notes that this is all too often ignored. The next two chapters are on aspects of the history and present situation of the Roman Church in China, from the time of Matteo Ricci. The author's love for the land from which he is exiled is strong, and he movingly appeals for sympathetic thought for the Christian exiles, and for concern for the non-Christian Chinese in the West. The fourth lecture is an examination of the Taoist spirit and of Christian humility, while the final one is devoted to a comparison of the universal love of Mo-tzŭ with the spirit of Christianity. It is rarely that the views of a Christian Chinese on these subjects are accessible in a Western tongue, and many will be glad to have this volume.

Dutch Introduction to the Bible. A group of Dutch Roman Catholic scholars, including some very well known names, have collaborated in the preparation of an Introduction to the Bible, published under the title *The World of the Bible*.[1] The field covered includes questions of inspiration, interpretation, canon, text and versions, languages, literary criticism, history and religion. The scholarship is guaranteed by the names of J. van der Ploeg, W. Grossouw, A. van den Born, J. Simons, and P. van der Meer, who figure amongst the writers, and the whole volume is packed with information. Account is taken of recent archaeological work, including the Qumran finds, and every care seems to have been taken to make the work up-to-date and reliable. In the chapter on the versions of the Bible the story of the Dutch, French, German and English versions will be found, where full account is taken of both Protestant and Catholic work. In the chapter on the Canon, there is a section on the Alexandrian Canon. While this title will be found in many books, its use is to be deprecated. There was no pre-Christian Greek Canon of the Old Testament, as is sufficiently indicated by the fact that of the post-Christian Greek manuscripts which contain this so-called Canon, no two agree in the list of works included. It should at once be added, however, that as against an occasional question like this which may be raised, the book abounds in good things, and readers will find it a sound and balanced guide to present-day learning in the whole field of Biblical studies.

[1] *De wereld van de Bijbel : Inleiding tot het lezen van de Heilige Schrift* [1957]. Het Spectrum, Utrecht.

Twilight of the Mystics. L. Cognet has written a study of seventeenth-century French mysticism, under the title *Twilight of the Mystics*.[2] The story centres in Madame Guyon and the conflict which developed between Fénelon and Bossuet, and the author brings out the way in which personalities and principles were interwoven in the story. After a short survey of the background of his study, he outlines the story of Mme Guyon. Married without consultation to a husband who brought her no happiness, she turned after his death to a religious life, only to find herself the object of persecution and the centre of strife. The disappointment of her brother at receiving no share of the fortune she renounced played its part in the story, as did ecclesiastical rivalries. At one point she was taken up by Fénelon and at another turned to Bossuet for help. That spiritual issues were involved in the disputes is not to be doubted, but the whole story brings out with distressing clearness the way in which even good people's motives are seldom unmixed. As a study of French mysticism of the period this book is not without interest and value ; as a study of human character and psychology it has no less interest. Few of the many characters who figure in the story emerge unsullied.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

[2] *Crépuscule des mystiques* [1958]. Desclée, Tournai

Entre Nous

Secular History in New Testament Times

It is very easy to think of the Biblical events as happening in a kind of vacuum, and so to clothe them with a certain unreality. It is, therefore, always true that books which deal with the scene and the history contemporary with the New Testament are of special interest and of special value. Such a book is *The Later Herods : The Political Background of the New Testament*, by Mr. Stewart Perowne, M.A., F.S.A. (Hodder and Stoughton ; 25s. net). Mr. Perowne has already shown his skill in the reconstruction of the history of these times in his previous volume, 'The Life and Times of Herod the Great' ; and if this book has not quite the compelling interest

of its predecessor that is not its author's fault, it is due to the fact that there is no character in it comparable in greatness with Herod the Great.

The best way to see the interest and the value of this book is not to move at random in it, but to take Mr. Perowne's reconstruction of the life of one of the great figures of the period. We choose as our sample Agrippa the First, who makes one fleeting appearance in the New Testament (Ac 12[1]) as the persecutor of the Church and the killer of James. Agrippa's is a fascinating story, and 'reads like a tale from *The Thousand and One Nights*'. Few men had greater contrasts of fortune.

Agrippa was three parts Idumaean and one part Jewish. He was brought up in Rome at the Court of Tiberius. He was a brilliant youth; he was wealthy; he spent money like water; and frequently he spent it in what were bribes for the future. He was the boon companion of Drusus, the son of Tiberius. When he was thirty-three disaster first fell upon him. He had worked his way through a fortune; Drusus died tragically; and Tiberius banished him from Court because he could not stand the memories that the sight of his son's boon companion brought.

Agrippa retired to Idumaea, for there was nowhere else that he could go, and there in a ruined watch-tower at Malatha near Beer-sheba he dragged out a wretched existence, and was only prevented from committing suicide by his wife. His uncle, Herod Antipas, 'that fox', gave him an unimportant post in his administration. It was not to last long. Agrippa and Antipas had a drunken argument in which Antipas taunted Agrippa with being a pauper, and once again Agrippa was penniless.

He betook himself to Pomponius Flaccus, the Governor of Syria. But he used his friendship with Flaccus to take bribes to exert his influence, and Flaccus banished him, and Agrippa again was in the depths.

He borrowed £1,000 to reach Rome, but was arrested for a debt of £15,000 before he could get away. He cut the cables of his ship and slipped off in the night. He stopped at Alexandria to borrow another £10,000. He reached Rome and exerted his old fascination over Tiberius who made him the tutor of his son Tiberius Gemellus. Agrippa, ever the borrower, borrowed £50,000 from Thallus, a Samaritan freedman. Agrippa now cultivated the friendship of Caligula, who was successor designate to Tiberius. In the presence of a servant he expressed the hope that Tiberius would soon die, and that Caligula would come to power. And not unnaturally he landed in gaol again. When in gaol he was given a drink of water by a slave called Thaumastus. Later Agrippa was to free Thaumastus and to take him back to Palestine as his chancellor; Agrippa had many faults but he did not forget.

In due time Tiberius died. Caligula gave Agrippa the revenues of the tetrarchy which had once belonged to Philip and the title of King. But now Agrippa's star was in the ascendant. Herod Antipas complained that after years of fidelity he had never received the title of King. Caligula's reply was to deprive him of all his territory and to give it to Agrippa. Caligula was more than half-mad, and proposed to put his own statue in the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem. Agrippa took his life in his hands to dissuade him and succeeded, a service which the Jews never forgot.

Caligula was not to reign for long. When he died Agrippa was instrumental in placing Claudius in the imperial power and Claudius rewarded him by giving him the whole kingdom which had once belonged to Herod the Great.

He was to enjoy it for only three years. He became ill and knew he was to die and made of his own death a public spectacle. And when he died Palestine was plunged into chaos again.

Such is the story of Agrippa the First. It is of the greatest interest to remember that all this was happening when Jesus was preaching and teaching in Palestine. It is an extraordinary thing to think of this Jewish King sharing in the making and unmaking of Roman Emperors and to remember what was going on in the political scene when Jesus was preaching. There is little wonder that the Jews looked for a conquering Messiah.

Mr. Perowne has reconstructed the political scene with erudition, with mastery of his material, with vividness and with lucidity.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

The Expository Times 1958–59.

Among new features will be:

1. *The Best Old Testament Commentaries.*

2. *Milestones in Books.* In this series well-known contributors will write of the books, not necessarily theological or even religious, which have exercised a formative influence upon their thinking. The first articles will be by Canon Raven, Principal N. H. Snaith and Dr. H. G. Wood.

3. *Great Themes of the New Testament* by Dr. William Barclay, University of Glasgow. Dr. Barclay will deal with the exegesis, origin of the passage, its place in N.T. thought and its relevance for to-day.

EDITOR

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.